

ISRAEL: REVOLUTION OR REFERENDUM?

Review

Introduction

- Chapter 1: [Something New](#)
- Chapter 2: [The Dream...](#)
- Chapter 3: [...Turned Nightmare](#)
- Chapter 4: [Within the Green Line](#)
- Chapter 5: [The Arabs of Israel](#)
- Chapter 6: [Moving to the Verge](#)
- Chapter 7: [The Destroyers from Within](#)
- Chapter 8: [The Legitimacy of Government and Revolution](#)
- Chapter 9: [Government in the Eyes of Judaism](#)
- Chapter 10: [Just and Unjust Laws](#)
- Chapter 11: [Jewish Authority](#)
- Chapter 12: [Democracy?](#)
- Chapter 13: [Referendum](#)

Review

Intifada! What is it if not the continuation of the Arab revolt against the Jew and their Jewish state?

Rabbi Meir Kahane, who has an enormous following in Israel, and particularly among the young, says the intifada phenomenon could have been crushed in two days but, instead, has been permitted to fester for more than two years. In its wake, Kahane says it destroys Jews, physically and spiritually-and threatens the very existence of the Jewish state.

Today the frightening alternatives must be faced at last. Israeli Jews are angry, frustrated and bitter. They are deeply concerned for themselves and their loved ones. They are eager to strike back against those Arabs who are allowed by the government to destroy them.

Kahane warns that the situation cannot continue. If the government cannot or will not protect Jewish lives and property, it loses the legitimate right to rule, and will force desperate Jews to take the law into their own hands.

There is another alternative! Kahane suggests that the Israeli government allow its angry citizens to go to the polls themselves, to decide those life and death issues that are tearing the country to pieces.

A referendum is the only alternative to save mainline Jews from both murderous Arabs and incited Jews. Kahane points out that The most fundamental obligation of government-and the very source of its legitimacy and right to rule over people-is its responsibility to guarantee the lives and safety of its citizens. If it either cannot, or will not, fulfill that obligation, it has no moral or legal right to rule.

In this incisive critique of Israeli government policies-and its historical look-back of fatal mistakes of Israel's founding generation, Kahane points up impossible inconsistencies between Zionism and Western Democracy.

Ever the prophetic teacher, Rabbi Kahane makes the case for letting the electorate speak for themselves. In the pages of this book, he advocates a national referendum, calling for a yes or no vote on the following:

[1] Shall the Knesset be dissolved and new elections open to all parties be held?

[2] Shall the winner be bound to implement the following program:

-Crush of the Arab revolt by every means possible.

-Annex Judea-Samaria-Gaza. -Remove all Arabs who are not prepared to accept the exclusive sovereignty of the Jewish people over all in the land of Israel. (This will allow those Arabs who do accept their right to remain in the land as non-citizens their personal rights but no national rights.)

Introduction

*** Any love that does not carry with it chastisement is not love. (Midrash, Bereshit Rabba 51)

*** One who has it in his power to chastise and does not is punished for it. (Talmud, Avoda Zara 18a)

*** Knaves and demagogues who are in power and seek to stay there are the first to cry out against chastisement of them. The fools and naive join them in their condemnation of those who see injustice and seek to abolish it. Those who love the Jewish people will be deterred by neither the knaves nor the naive.

Chapter 1: Something New

"Traitor!" "Prime Minister of the Intifada!" "Resign!"

The angry and bitter cries of hundreds of angry and bitter settlers who had gathered to lay to rest yet another victim of Arab terror. This time it was a middle-aged American Jewish immigrant who had come to live in the Samarian settlement of Ariel. The embittered settlers who stood at the open grave knew

Frederick Rosenfeld to be a quiet, mild-mannered individual who loved the land, who loved to hike in the ancient Biblical Israel of which Samaria is an integral part, and who claimed to have many Arab acquaintances. It was this combination that led to his death, his murder. Frederick Rosenfeld had, as was his wont, gone for a private hike in the countryside of Ariel and there met two Arab shepherds. That they had approached in a friendly manner and spoken with him was clear from the photographs in his camera. Frederick Rosenfeld had taken photographs of the Arabs and had been photographed together with them. All this, of course, before he was brutally slain by them.

Now, a day later, the Jewish settlers, all nationalists who had voted for the right-wing Parties in the last elections, are interrupting the address of the Prime Minister of Israel at the open grave of the murdered Jew, shouting: "Traitor! Resign!" And when the Prime Minister is unable to finish the speech and is hastily moved out of the area by a heavy force of police and secret service agents, the crowd gathers around his car, banging on the roof and continuing to shout, "Traitor! Resign!"

The Prime Minister was not a left-wing appeaser. He was not the Labor Party's Shimon Peres. He was Yitzhak Shamir, the presumably hard-line head of Menachem Begin's right-wing Herut Movement and Likud Party, former head of the underground Stern group. The terrorist (sic) group that fought the British when they ruled over the Land of Israel. And yet, the angry crowd not only shouted the angry and bitter epithets but banged on the car and threatened physical

injury.

Something new and serious was occurring in Israel.

A leaflet bearing the signature "Gideon's Sword" urges Jews to deal "a large and fatal blow" to Arabs. Another leaflet, signed "Dov," contains explicit instructions about the best firearms to use against the enemies, and what to do with these weapons after the shooting so that the police will not be able to track down the perpetrators. The police say they will investigate the matter, and a senior Justice Ministry source describes the development as "very serious; the matter must be dealt with."

Leftist Citizens Rights Movement MK Dedi Zucker says that if even a few people take those leaflets seriously they "could bring a great calamity on us all."

Something new and revolutionary was occurring in Israel.

It is a warm, May morning in the capital city of Israel. On Jaffa Road, Jerusalem's main street, hundreds of Jews mill about. Across from the main post office, a handful of Jews wait for bus number 19 while around the corner sits the main police station in what is known as the Russian Compound. An Arab walks quickly to where the Jews are sitting, draws a knife and swiftly stabs five people. Two die, three are wounded. The dead are 91 and 76 years old. The Jews chase the Arab who flees. He is caught, and then the police move in with batons flailing. They rescue the Arab.

The furious Jews, led by Kach leader Meir Kahane, now attempt to march on the Old City crying "vengeance! vengeance!" They clash with the police who charge with horses into the crowd, tear-gassing them, in a broadcast a few days later, Voice of America correspondent Charles Weiss, an openly hostile opponent of Kahane, admits that in the crowd that marched on the Arabs and clashed with the police, there were seen men carrying attaché cases, and elderly women, too.

It is less than a week after the murder of the two Jews in Jerusalem. The authorities now announce the discovery of the body of a soldier, missing for nearly two months. The soldier has been shot in the head, his body brutalized. He had been hitchhiking at a spot well within the so-called Green Line, inside the pre-1967 borders of Israel.

In the port city of Ashdod where the soldier, Avi Sasportas, had lived, riots break out. The police, in panic, sweep through the city urging Arabs to get themselves immediately to the nearest police station for their own safety. Crowds march on the police stations, stoning buildings and police vehicles. The next day, following the emotional funeral of the 20-year-old boy hundreds of Ashdod Jews stone Arab cars on the road to Gaza that bypasses the city. Again, they clash with police.

It is the day after an Arab, riding the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem bus on the main highway in the country seized the wheel and drove the bus down a steep ravine. The bus explodes in flames. Fourteen people die, but the terrorist lives, and for a while is placed in the same Hadassa Hospital ward as the Jews he attempted to murder. The following day an unprecedented wave of anti-Arab riots sweep Israel. They begin in Jerusalem where Arab cars are stoned and burned as crowds shout, "Death to the Arabs!" They then spread to the rest of the country An Arab driving past Moshav Shibolim in the Negev is stoned. His car crashes and he is killed. Another Arab is badly injured when he is hit by a rock near Ashkelon. Police throughout the land are momentarily caught by surprise and hasten to attempt to protect Arabs, using tear gas and clubs against Jews. For the first time, crowds of Jews turn on the police, stoning them. Tens are arrested but the rioting continues for three days.

Shimon Peres, arriving at the funeral of one of the murdered Jews, is met by such a wave of

hatred and anger that he is forced to leave the area under heavy police guard. Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir deplores the attacks, calling them "a loss of nerve and will." The cabinet condemns "irresponsible acts committed by Jews filled with bitterness against Arabs."

But that is precisely the point. The Jews are bitter and, for the first time, bitter enough to attack Arabs openly and police, too, when the latter move to stop the rioting. Neither Shamir, the government, President Herzog or anyone else makes much of an impression on the frustrated, bitter and frightened Jews-fearful for the lives of family and children.

The angry and mass outpouring of bitter fury as hundreds of Jewish settlers pour out of their settlements in Judea-Samaria-Gaza, the infuriated urban crowds that riot at funerals of murdered Jews and in the streets, and the rise of Jewish underground groups are part of a clear, definite and terribly serious change that is taking place today inside Israel, and that-unless stopped by getting at the root cause of the anger and hate-will lead inexorably to mass attacks on Arabs and, worse, to threat of revolution and civil war against the Jewish government of a Jewish State, barely 40 years old.

The most fundamental obligation of government-the source of its legitimacy and right to rule over the people-is its responsibility to guarantee the lives and safety of its citizens. If it either cannot or will not fulfill that obligation, it faces the loss of its moral and legal authority. It cannot continue. The process by which a magnificent - Divine! - dream of 1900 years is turned, daily into a growing nightmare, cannot continue. For if we persist in this way, the Jewish State faces horror of horrors-awesome, national tragedy- it cannot continue and it will not. The only question is: Will the process of disintegration and collapse be prevented by revolution or referendum?

Chapter 2: The Dream...

For 1900 years the Jew had a dream. For each and every Jew who crawled the earth of Exile it was the same dream. The magnificent Jewish obsession. It was called Return to Zion. Driven from his land, Eretz Yisrael, by the Roman legions, the Jew wandered the four corners of the earth, experiencing all the degradations and terrors and horrors of an Exile that his Torah had long before warned him of:

"And the L~rd shall scatter thee among all peoples, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth And among these nations shalt thou have no repose and there shall be no rest for the sole of thy foot; but the L~rd shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes and languishing of soul. And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear night and day and shalt have no assurance of thy life. In the morning thou shalt say 'Would it were evening!' and at evening thou shalt say 'Would it were morning!' for the fear of thy heart which thou shalt fear and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see..."

The reality awesomely mirrored the Biblical admonition. A people that had stubbornly refused to cleave unto the commandments of their G~d when it sat in its own land, was thrust into all the humiliation and horrors of a punishment called Exile. And how they yearned for Zion! How they raised their eyes unto the heavens and beseeched their return to it! How they made it an integral part of their prayers, their laws, their lives!

Stumbling through what appeared to be an endless nightmare or Jew-hating terror, the Jew of the Exile began a saga of horror that defied all logic, let alone humanity. In Christian Europe he became the target of ignorant, bloodthirsty mobs of rural and urban peasants alike. The Middle Ages saw the bloodthirsty mobs called to a Crusade to "liberate" the Holy Land. Everywhere that the soles of their heels trampled, they came crashing down on the head of the Jew, leaving him bloodied and broken. In the cities of Speyer and Worms, Jews were faced with the choice of forced conversion to Christianity or death and rape- More than 1500 were murdered as they clung to their faith. In Cologne and the Rhine Valley, more than 12,000 Jews perished at the

hands of the "soldiers of Christ."

Change of time and venue meant nothing for the Jews of the Exile. As the next century came into being, death and torture came to the Jews of Bohemia and France, and in the English town of York, the entire Jewish community was massacred. Truly, a multinational corporation of "Death to the Jews."

In Paris the Talmud was burned and a pious Martin Luther called for a similar fate for the people who had produced and studied it. Torture, rape, forced conversion, mass slaughter, horror-this was the gruel. And the awful words of the Prophet Jeremiah, the Prophet of Lamentations, rang in Jewish ears:

I am the man that hath seen affliction by the end rod of His wrath...Surely against me He turneth His hand again and again all the day..." (Lamentations, 3)

The Middle Ages gave the Jews such Christian benefits as the Crusade of the Shepherds that massacred every Jew between Azen and Toulouse.

And the martyrs of Chinin. Being accused of poisoning the wells, 166 Jews were thrown alive into the flames.

And the Bavarian "Jew-killers" of Armleder who massacred thousands of Jews with pitchforks and axes in the Rhineland.

And the Holocaust of the Black Plague. The filthy unwashed mobs and noblemen of the Middle Ages were decimated by the disease and the cause was, of course, the Jew. Tens of thousands-at the most minimal estimate-and probably well over 200,000 hapless Jews were hanged, burned, drowned and hacked to death by the gentiles of the Exile as an antidote to the Black Plague.

And the "blood-libels." The Jews of Norwich, England were accused of murdering a Christian child and drinking his blood. They died horribly. And Spain followed suit with its own infamous blood libel case, the "Holy Child of La Guardia."

And the insane charge of 'desecration of the Host," when Jews were accused of beating and stabbing the wafer that made up the Eucharist. More than 100,000 Jews died because of that madness as the accusation spread through Franconia and Bavaria and on to Austria.

And the expulsions. Spain, Portugal, France, England. Jewish communities that were made up of loyal, quiet, and above all, terrified Jews were uprooted and expelled. The abominations were accompanied by murder, rape and humiliation. Western Europe was a cemetery for the Jew; for both the dead and the living.

And as he fled East, the temporary haven found by the Jews turned into a Slavic nightmare. In Poland and Russia, the Jew found Cossacks and Poles who fought each other but who happily joined together to exterminate him. The years 1648-9, saw a quarter of a million Jews massacred, and the Ukrainian hero Bogdan Chmielnicki will forever be the symbol of the brute animal who shed the blood of untold numbers of innocent Jews.

The murders and massacres the economic oppression, the unbearable life, made up the exile for the Jew down through our times and the era of the Czar and Dreyfus and Hitler. And during all those centuries, the nearly two millennia of nightmare, the Jew in the Exile had a dream. It was called Shivat Zion, the return to Zion. He possessed the image of the land, his land, the Land of Israel, the land of the People of Israel. To there he would return and build his state, free of the horrors and the terror and the fear and the humiliation of the Exile, a place where he and his children could walk tall and proud and free and-above all-unafraid.

In the ghetto in Frankfurt and Rome, in the mellah of Morocco and Yemen in the poverty of the shtetl of Poland and Russia, in the misery and humiliation of France and Germany, in the ever present insecurity and terror of an Exile that grasped at his body and attempted to extinguish his soul, in the cursed foreign lands where he wandered without end and where he was a stranger, cursed and despised; in the Exile to which he had been cast in realization of the warning of the Almighty-in all these, when he rose each morning to face an uncertain day, he wrapped himself in prayer shawl and phylacteries and faced Jerusalem. Not Mecca or Jedda or Cairo or Damascus or Rome or Moscow. Only Jerusalem, only Zion. If he lived to the north of Zion, he faced south. If he lived to the south, he faced north. The Jew in the west intoned the bittersweet poem of Rabbi Vehuda Halevi "MY HEART IS IN THE EAST AND I AM IN THE WEST"-and turned east, while the Jew in Eastern Cochinchina turned west. And so it was that millions upon millions of wanderers were drawn each morning and afternoon and evening by some powerful spiritual magnet called Zion, to affirm their Zionism and to turn and say in unison, in the universal Hebrew language:

'And may our eyes behold Thy return to Zion in mercy Blessed art Thou, O L~rd, who restorest Thy divine presence to Zion.'

When they prayed for rain, it was the season in Zion, so that the crops of the Holy Land might prosper.

Bless for us, O L~rd our G~d, this year...and bestow dew and rain for a blessing upon the face of the land..." The land. The reference was to the land. Zion.

Their prayers were obsessed with *Return*.

"Return in mercy to the city Jerusalem and dwell in it as Thou hast promised. Rebuild it soon, in our days, as an everlasting structure and speedily establish in it the throne of David. Sound the great Shofar for our freedom; lift up the banner to bring our exiles together and assemble us from the four corners of the earth. Blessed art thou, O L~rd, who gatherest the dispersed of His people, Israel."

Each holiday the Jew gathered in the synagogue and, praying to his G~d, spoke the following words: "Thou hast chosen us from among all peoples.

Thou hast loved us and desired us, exalted us above all tongues and sanctified us through Thy commandments... And because of our sins we were exiled from our country and banished from our land. We can no longer go up as pilgrims to worship Thee in the great and holy Temple which was called by Thy Name, on account of the hand that was thrust on Thy Sanctuary... Our Father, Our King, speedily reveal Thy glorious majesty to us; shine forth and be exalted over us in the sight of all the living. Unite our scattered people from among all the nations; gather our dispersed from the far ends of the earth. Bring us to Zion Thy city with ringing song, and to Jerusalem Thy sanctuary with everlasting joy..."

Twice yearly, once at the joyous Passover Seder as Zionism was realized through the national liberation of the Jews from Egypt, and then at the conclusion of the Yom Kippur service-the Jew raised his eyes to heaven and his voice on high and shouted:

"Next year in Jerusalem!" Not New York or Paris or Beirut or Baghdad. Not Mecca or any holy city on the Arabian Peninsula. Jerusalem. Zion. A Zionism that predated Theodore Herzl by millennia, a Zionism that did not have to be joined by the Jew because it was part and parcel of him from the day he was born.

"Next year in Jerusalem!" It was not a mere prayer, a request, the expression of a supplicant. It was far more. It was a desperate dream, an oasis of hope in the midst of a desert of despair. It was an article of faith by a people that believed with a complete faith in the

promise of the G-d of history and His prophets:

"And the L~rd thy G~d will return thee from thy captivity and have compassion upon thee and will return and gather thee from all the peoples whither the L~rd thy G~d hath scattered thee. If any of thy dispersed be in the uttermost parts of the heaven, from thence will the L~rd thy G~d gather thee... And the L~rd thy G~d will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed and thou shalt possess it." (Dvarim 30: 3-5)

The life cycle of the Jew was never free of the ever present love of Zion. When he was born and circumcised, at the joyous feast, Grace after meals was said and the little Jewish infant heard the words:

"May the All Merciful send us the faultless Messiah... to bring good tidings and consolation to a people dispersed and divided amongst the nations."

He was already a Zionist.

When he reached the age of spiritual manhood, the Bar Mitzvah, he read the blessings after the Torah and intoned:

"Have compassion on Zion, for it is the source of our life; save the humbled soul, speedily in our days. Blessed art Thou, O L~rd, who makest Zion rejoice in her children."

He was a firmer Zionist.

When he married his beloved and the happiest moment of his life was upon him he smashed a glass in remembrance of the destruction of Zion so that he would remind himself that so long as he remained in Exile and Zion was in the hands of strangers, there could never be complete happiness for him. And as he stood under the canopy he heard the blessings proclaim:

May Zion exult at the joyful reunion of her children in Jerusalem. Blessed art Thou O L~rd, who causes Zion to rejoice in her children... O L~rd, our G~d, may there soon be heard in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem-the sounds of joy and gladness, the sound of joyous wedding celebrations, the sound of young people feasting and singing..."

A Zionist couple was joined.

And when he died, how often was he buried with a tiny bag of earth from the Land of Israel. If the Jew was kept by the gentile from coming to the earth of Zion, he brought a little of it into the Exile so that it would sleep with him until the day of Return that would surely come. He died a Zionist. Each morning as he reached the sacred Shma-"Hear O Israel, the L~rd is our G~d, the L~rd is One" the Jew preceded it by exclaiming:

"O bring us in peace from the four corners of the earth and lead us upright to our land..."

Each day he looked at the hostile, hating world that sought to swallow him up alive, to devour him and his children. Each day he looked at the "reality" of the numbers and strength and power of the gentile and, turning, he walked into the synagogue, looked up to G~d and whispered: "Even so, I believe, I believe."

It was a belief. It was a dream. It was a vision. It was a desperate need and passion, in the midst of the horror and fear and terror and humiliation.

To return to Zion and to no more! No more horror. No more fear. No more terror. No more humiliation. Only tranquility and pride and security and sovereignty. A Jewish State. THE DREAM.

Chapter 3: ...Turned Nightmare

"To be a free people in our land..." (from the Israeli national anthem Ha'Tikva)

The dream? Say rather, turned nightmare. Indeed, today there is a Jewish state. Through Heaven's mercies and Jewish sacrifice, there exists, today, a sovereign Jewish state. The dream.

The Dream? Is there no fear in the State of Israel? Is there no humiliation? Is there no terror? No gnawing sense of foreboding? Months and months; a year; a year and-a-half; more, of an Arab uprising. And the army of Israel that in 1967 was able to smash Arab armies, nations, and win a war in six days, is apparently unable to put an end to rioting by Arab women and children who attack the soldiers with stones and firebombs-unafraid, taunting, cursing, hating. And the soldiers of Israel stand in frustration, hobbled by insane orders, drafted by confused politicians who are, themselves, ideologically bewildered and guilt-ridden, unsure of the justice of their own cause and fearful of world reaction. The soldiers' hands are tied by limitations on their freedom to act in self-defense (the Central Command insists that soldiers attacked by stone-throwing Arabs only fire into the air and warn the mob to stand back; then, if still alive or not seriously hurt, to shoot at one of the stone throwers, and then-assuming G~d has been good-to shoot at the crowd). Is it any wonder that so many soldiers simply do not enter areas of danger? Or, worse, back away from confrontation, knowing that if they do not shoot they may be seriously injured or worse, and if they do, they may be court-martialed, as so many of the finest elite soldiers already have been? And as the Arabs see the soldiers back away; and as they see that army policy is to allow them, more and more, to do whatever they wish in their own villages-should it surprise us that they grow bolder and more confident, attacking soldiers and vehicles almost with impunity? Is it surprising that little, autonomous Palestine "states" are springing up daily in various Arab villages where one can see PLO flags flying boldly from minarets and private armies of youth training openly with hatchets and swords?

More and more Jews are attacked as they drive along highways in the liberated areas as well as on roads inside the State of Israel itself? This is the greatest tragedy of them all! A Jewish State that rose to free the Jew from terror and fear. And today in the Jewish state that did arise, there is terror; there is fear. Jews are afraid in their own land.

In Jerusalem, the capital of Israel, the Jewish holy city Jews are attacked with stones and firebombs. Jews are murdered in cold blood by Arabs who are unafraid. Jewish automobiles and buses are regularly attacked. Jews fear to go into the Old City of Jerusalem through the Arab sections. Rare are those who enter through the Arab sections. Rare are those who enter through Sha'ar Shchem (Damascus Gate). In Jaffa, buses are routinely attacked. Jaffa is not in the "occupied territories," but is rather the home of Israeli Arabs-the loyal Arabs.

In the northern Israeli city of Acre, Jews are physically attacked and less and less dare to go into the Old City there. Acre is a part of the State of Israel. Automobiles driving along the Wadi Ara highway are targets of Molotov cocktails and rocks. The number of Jewish automobiles using the highway has dropped by fully 50%. Wadi Ara is not in the "occupied territories." It is in the heartland of Israel, running between the cities of Hadera and Afula. In the Galilee, Israeli Arabs attack Jews, a grenade is thrown at a police vehicle, police arrest Arabs of Israel as members of terrorist groups. Soldiers are attacked as they hitch rides-attacked, kidnapped, murdered. Woman soldiers are forbidden to hitch rides and men are strictly limited. This is the free Jewish State of which the national anthem Ha'Tikva says: "To be a free people in our own land..."

The bitter truth is that the Jew is afraid in larger and larger areas of his own state. And the bitterer truth is that the Arab is not. There is no area in the land, no part of Israel that Arabs avoid. They fear going nowhere-at any time, day or night. Arab kiosks and stalls are to be found in every Jewish market place. There are no Jewish market places in Gaza or any other Arab town or city in any of the liberated areas or, for that matter, in any Arab village in Israel itself.

The Arabs would never allow it.

The most fundamental obligation of government-the source of its legitimacy and right to rule over people-is its responsibility to guarantee the lives and safety of its citizens. If it either cannot or will not fulfill that obligation, it faces the loss of its moral and legal right of authority.

In the light of this, consider the reality of life in Israel over the past two years (1988-89):

"It was not a suicide mission. It was an action to sanctify Allah... Anyone of us can do a similar thing-from the age of six until the age of 50..."

These are the words of the wife of Abdel Hadi Suleiman Ghanem, who murdered sixteen Jews on a bus traveling on the main highway of Israel, between Tel Aviv and Jerusalem. She is correct. Anyone could do a similar thing, it was such a simple act of horror. The Arab, a resident of Gaza, who like all the Arabs of Judea-Samaria-Gaza, entered Israel freely.

Following the Six Day War, and in order to win peace and gratitude from the Arabs, Israel decided to give them total freedom to travel and work in Israel and thus raise their living standards. Such a thing, some believed, would guarantee peace in the territories.

The Arab, thus, simply got on the bus in Tel Aviv (having already tested the same route previously so as to work out the details of his plan). Then, at the point he had previously decided was the ideal one for the scheme, he rose, walked over to the driver and suddenly seized the wheel, holding it tightly and turning it sharply to the right, whereupon the bus went over the cliff and into a deep chasm. Fourteen Jews died immediately and two others passed away later in the hospital.

Arabs travel Israeli buses freely daily. 'Anyone of us can do a similar thing... " Indeed. That particular act of murder on July 6, 1989 took place deep inside the heart of The Dream, The State of Israel. It was merely (at that time) the latest in a series of murders of Jews living in a state created so that Jews would never again be murdered because of their Jewishness.

Two weeks earlier, on the morning of June 22, Professor Menachem Stern, an internationally renowned Hebrew University historian, was walking to work. He took his usual path, through Jerusalem's Valley of the Cross, but never arrived at the University. He was found murdered, discovered by a teacher and her first grade students who were there on a school outing. Professor Stern had been stabbed five times in the chest. The police agreed that the murder act was a "nationalist one" the obscene euphemism Israeli authorities now use, rather than the normal 'Arab terror.' Professor Stern was an expert on the Second Temple, whose destruction led to the honors of the Exile. He was murdered in the Third Jewish State. The Dream.

On June 17th, 1989, An American Jew who had settled in the Samaritan settlement of Ariel was found murdered near the village of Burkin. Frederick Rosenfeld, his friends say enjoyed hiking in the area and was an opponent of those who wished to remove the Arabs from the land. According to the Arabs who murdered him and who were later apprehended, he met them, chatted with them, and showed them his camera. They took pictures together, ate some fruit together, and then they stabbed him in the back. Rosenfeld did not die on the spot. He bled to death that entire day, in an area in which many Arabs pass. No one came to his aid. The American Jew left his native land to come home to Israel; The Dream.

Within the space of one week, May 3-May 8, the following events occurred within the State of Israel, the realization of The Dream.

It was a few minutes before 11 AM on Jerusalem's main Street, Jaffa Road. Hundreds of Jews walked to and fro, busy with their individual affairs. Across the street from Bus 19 stop was the main Post Office, and around the corner was the main Police Station. Jerusalem, Capital of

Israel, heart of The Dream.

It was a few minutes before 11 AM, and an Arab walked toward the bus Stop, drew a knife, and, shouting Allah Akhbar! Allah is Great! proceeded to stab five Jews, murdering two of them. The two dead were 91 and 76 years old. The Arab, Nidal Zaloun, ran and was caught. The furious crowd sought to do unto him what he did to others. The police charged in with horses, tear-gassing the Jews. The Arab was saved and eventually sentenced to life imprisonment in Ramle prison where he eats and drinks at Jewish expense, received weekly visits from the Red Cross (I know this, since I sat in Ramle prison, too, though never meriting visits from the international mercy agencies). It should come as no surprise that, as of this writing, the Hizballah Muslim terrorists have demanded that, as part of any plan to free the Israeli and western hostages they hold, Israel must also release the murderer of the two elderly Jews in Jerusalem and the murderer of the sixteen Jews the Jerusalem-Tel Aviv bus. Let it be remembered that in 1985, Israel freed no less than 1150 Arab terrorists for six soldiers. Among the 1150 were numerous murderers of Jews. Madness begets madness.

The Arab, Nidal Zaloun, readily admitted the murders, saying: "I slept the night before in Al Aksa Mosque (on Jerusalem's Temple Mount), and after praying the Al Kadar prayer, planned the act. My purpose was to kill Jews."

Immediately after saving the Arab's life in order that he might serve a prison sentence until such time as he will be freed, the police mounted a massive action, bringing in some 3,500 men to Jerusalem. Their purpose? To prevent acts of vengeance against Arabs. The cost would, of course, be borne by the Jews. Meanwhile, the police using tear gas and horse, broke up a protest march of Kach members. Eleven, including myself were arrested and held in the same prison as the Arab who had just murdered two Jews. The Dream had taken insane turns.

That day too, the saga of Oran Barahami ended. Oran was a 13-year-old boy from the city of Bat Yam. Bat Yam is not in the "occupied territories." Bat Yam is not on the other side of the "Green Line," i.e. outside the pre-1967 boundaries of Israel. If anything, Bat Yam is on the blue line, on the Mediterranean, a suburb of Tel Aviv. He had disappeared on April 24th and during that time the police, in another obscene habit, threw out all possible reasons for his disappearance except the most natural and logical one-Arabs. Now, he had been found. In Jaffa, the former all-Arab town which had been annexed by Tel Aviv after the 1948 war and which was still a center of thousands of Jew-hating Arabs. Oran Barahami was found in Jaffa. He had been brutally slain but first sexually mutilated and raped. According to the police, the body was mutilated so badly that at first the pathologist had difficulty determining its sex. Two Arabs from Gaza were apprehended and confessed. The parents of Oran Barahami are Persian Jews whose families had come to Israel to realize The Dream.

Still within the same week, on May 7, the body of 19-year-old Avi Sasportas was finally found. It climaxed weeks of searching in which thousands of soldiers and civilians participated. Last seen hitching a ride at the Hodaya Junction (near the city of Ashkelon, well within the Green Line, well within The Dream), his body was found in a shallow grave. He had been shot in the head and his body cut to pieces.

The most "interesting" aspect of the horror is that Avi Sasportas was a soldier, a paratrooper. Now, a soldier who falls in battle for his land carries with him the partial comfort of defending his homeland. A soldier who stands in his country hitching a ride, and is murdered, gives unto his family not the slightest balm. Only horrible tragedy. And shame. Nothing could more underline the reality of The Dream turned into grotesque nightmare.

And the cabinet meeting that followed the discovery of the body only added to the mortification by calling for restrictions on hitchhiking by soldiers. 'To be a free people in our own land...'

Serious rioting broke out in Ashdod, with the police blaming "supporters of Rabbi Meir Kahane."

Of course... Would it were true. The truth is that what Israel was seeing was the beginning, the seeds of a spontaneous potential uprising by furious, frightened Jews of all persuasions.

Even as Avi Sasportas was being buried, the hunt continued for yet another 19-year old soldier, Han Sa'adon from Ashkelon, last seen on May 3rd. Frantic efforts were mounted to find the soldier who was last seen hitchhiking at the Masmiya Junction, deep inside Israel. The youngest of seven children of a working class family in Ashkelon, his sister said of him:

"My brain tells me he could be alive but my heart says that something horrible has happened. If he was kidnapped, then mother will die, I'm sure of it. He was... sorry he is, her favorite son."

The Dream.

Purim played a particularly ironic joke on The Dream, On March 22, 1989, as the Jews of Tel Aviv celebrated Purim and the redemption of Persian Jews from the arch-hater Haman, Abad al Rahman Muhamas Zakut suddenly ran amok in Tel Aviv's northern section, a wealthy and established area, the majority of whose residents are adamantly opposed to any consideration of removing the Arabs. He murdered 74-year-old Dr Kurt Shelisnger in front of his home. Chased to the roof of a nearby building, he stabbed a policeman who, oddly, did not shoot him when attacked. The Arab told police that he saw Jews celebrating and that drove him to wish to kill some of them. His testimony was given from a hospital bed in a room which he shared with a Jew whom he had stabbed and wounded. The Dream. Say rather, the insanity.

On March 14, 1989 in the northern Israeli city of Nahariya, founded by solid, moral German Jews horrified at any thought of removal of Arabs, the body of Brurya Rotman was found. Police arrested Israeli Arabs and said that the motive was "nationalistic." On February 24, 1989, First Sergeant Binyamin Meisner was on patrol in the Casbah of Shchem, in Samaria. From the roof above came crashing down on his head a building block. He died there killed by a stone. Stones do not kill... Sergeant Meisner. 25, came from the wealthy town of Tivon, a suburb of Haifa, and was a sportsman, member of the national water polo team and member of the Nature Society. His circles look with horror on any suggestion of removal of the Arabs.

It is fascinating to note the reaction of the Israeli army to this last incident; fascinating and instructive for those who wish to understand what happened to The Dream. The Chief of Staff, Dan Shomron (who during that same period gained entry into the Pantheon of incredible Statements by declaring before the world we cannot put down the intifada"), sternly declared that the residents of the Casbah would "pay a heavy price. We will undoubtedly respond, and after the response they will not repeat their acts."

And so, on February 26th, the response came. The army blew up the upper floor of a building in the Casbah from where the assailants dropped the stone slab. Windows of homes overlooking the alley were bricked up and the area sealed off. The floor that was destroyed was unoccupied, and the owner, former Shchem Mayor Hafez Tiuqan showed his remorse and fear by stating that the demolition was "a destruction of civilization, history and culture. This has no deterrent effect whatsoever." As the explosions went off, shouts of "Allah Akhbar" were heard from adjacent buildings. In March, Ibrahim Taktuk was arrested for the murder of Meisner. His house was demolished. Next day fresh graffiti read: "We salute the hero, Ibrahim Taktuk." It is clear that Dan Shomron has terrified the Arabs.

One further note on the madness. When it was learned that the roof of another building nearby was damaged, the head of the Israeli Civil Administration promised to pay for the damages. The Dream...

On the Sabbath, February 18, 1989, Shlomo Cohen, a 21 year old soldier on leave, left his home to go to prayers at the Western Wall inside the Old City of Jerusalem. As the young soldier and a friend walked through a narrow alleyway leading to Zion Gate, they were ambushed by five

Arabs who stabbed Shlomo Cohen to death.

Zion Gate is one of several gates leading into the Old City. As The Dream becomes polluted, more and more of these gates become "dangerous" for Jews. Thus, Damascus Gate and those near it are virtually abandoned by Jews, since they lead into the Moslem Quarter. Jaffa Gate, leading into the Christian or Armenian Quarter is much more the accepted "safe" gate, while "safest" of all for Jews is Zion Gate. The shameful desecration of the dream does not even reflect the truth. Shlomo Cohen was murdered near the "safest" gate and the Jews who live on Mount Zion are filled with stories of the daily attacks, humiliations and fears they undergo at the hands of Arabs in Jerusalem, capital of Israel, of The Dream.

In response to the murder, Mayor Teddy Kollek of Jerusalem, exponent par excellence of coexistence between Jews and Arabs in Jerusalem, said: "The existing (security) arrangements are excellent. But even the best plans can't prevent an individual crime like this."

As for Shlomo Cohen's father, his comment as his son's body was lowered into his grave was, "put me in his place; don't leave me here." The Dream...

A point of departure. While dealing with the murder of so many Jewish soldiers, not in battle, it is well to note that well before the outbreak of the Arab rioting known as the intifada, soldiers in Israel were murdered as they stood, hitching rides, in the state of The Dream. Consider a partial list of murdered soldiers:

September 20, 1987 Hanoah Denman, a Dutch convert to Judaism, stood at the Haifa-Nahariya crossroads, going back to his base. Two Arabs gave him a lift, and near Kfar Masarik murdered him with an axe.

April 6, 1985 Akiva Shaltiel from Rosh Ha'ayin. Just a few kilometers from his home as he was returning on leave, he was picked up, strangled and hacked to death. His body was found 150 meters from the Petach Tikva-Rosh Ha'ayin road. December 1984: Hadas Kedmi, a woman soldier, got a lift at the Country Club crossroads near Herzeliya and was let out near Haifa. Her body was found weeks later in the Carmel woods. She had been gang-raped and brutally murdered.

December 1985 Moshe Tamam. Returning from Tiberias, he hitched a ride near the Beit Lid crossroads, near Netaniva. His body was brutally cut up and found near the Arab village of Yabad.

December 1983: David Manos. Picked up by Arabs on the Lod-Petach Tikva road and taken to a cave where he was strangled and brutalized. What makes this case especially horrible is the fact that for weeks, the police refused to declare that the motive was terrorism, and even hinted that Manos had been seen in a homosexual bar. The truth is that he was murdered on the day that he was declared missing, but in effect was murdered twice-once by the Arabs and the second time by the Israeli authorities.

May 1983: David Bukra. Received a lift at the Sharon junction on his way to Tiberias. His dismembered body was found near the Arab village of Atil. He had been shot in the head. November 1980: Avi Brumberg of Zichron Yaakov. Received a lift near his base, Camp 80. Shot in the back, his gun and papers were stolen and his body was thrown into the road.

January 1979: David Shamir Received a lift at the Kerem Shalom crossroads on his way to a party in Tel Aviv. After a desperate struggle in which he was stabbed in all parts of his body he died. December 1973: Eli Lupo received a lift near the Beit Lid crossroads, near Netaniya. He was axed in the head, stabbed, and his body buried. He was found the following year. Jewish soldiers of the Jewish State in Jewish uniform with Jewish weapons, murdered as they hitched rides. The Dream. All that is left is to mention that many of the Arab murderers were later freed

in the exchange of 1150 terrorists for six Israeli soldiers. To return to the year or the intifada:

On January 5, 1989, the body of a taxi driver from Petach Tikva, Shimon Edri, was found near the Yakir crossroads in Samaria. He had been shot twice in the chest and had fought bitterly before dying. He, too, was murdered twice, as the police raised the suspicion that he might have been the victim of a criminal act under circumstances the police would not spell out, but which inexorably led to suspicions against the victim. The family vowed never to forgive the stain on the honor of the murdered Jew.

On December 6, 1988, Yaakov Parag, from the little settlement of Bracha overlooking Shchem, wrote in *Nekuda*, the magazine of the settlers in Judea-Samaria-Gaza: "We and the people of Israel, too, should not see in the intifada, an interruption. We must continue to travel, to build and to live as usual..."

One week later, on December 13th, Yaakov Parag was on guard duty in a field near the settlement. He was attacked by a shepherd from the nearby Arab village of Burin, who shattered his skull with a rock and then shot him twice in the head. The Arab, Hamdan Najjar, then opened fire on an army command car that passed by killing one soldier and wounding two others. The commander of the army's Central Command, General Amram Mitzna, declared that the incident was "an isolated one that does not indicate anything." It was the same Mitzna who, after a Jewish bus had been attacked near the refugee camp of Dohaisha in Bethlehem, wounding a pregnant woman, and angry settlers had attacked the camp in retaliation, declared: "I have never seen such an abomination as this," He referred of course to the Jewish reaction, not to the attack on the bus.

The settlers were besides themselves with fury. Pointing out that Parag had been armed and had apparently hesitated to use the weapon, they condemned the outrageous policy of arresting settlers who defend themselves. Commenting on the fact that the Arab had attacked an army command car, the secretary of the settlement, Nitzan Vemini, declared: "This proves that the Arabs are not afraid of the army" And settlement leader Benny Katzover added: "The effectiveness of the army's deterrence has been lost."

On November 4, 1988, the body of 33-year-old Boaz Gil, a truck driver from Kfar Sava was found shot to death near the Lehavir junction in the Negev. His truck was abandoned and found later north of Gaza. Four Arabs from Gaza were arrested.

And on October 30, the heavens opened up and wept in Jericho. There, in the city that was the first to fall before the invading Children of Israel, more than 3000 years ago an Eged bus is suddenly hit by three firebombs that crash through the windows. The bus turns into an inferno. Screaming passengers attempt to flee through the windows and doors. Twenty-seven year-old Rachel Weiss, a religious woman from Jerusalem, watches as her three infants are roasted alive. Passengers plead with her to escape as the bus turns into an inferno. A soldier, David Delarosa, attempts to help her and the children escape. The smoke becomes a choking trap and the soldier is pulled to safety (Later he will die from the resulting damage to his lungs and heart.) Rachel Weiss and her three babies remain in the bus.

They are buried the next day in a grave divided in four parts, on the Mount of Olives. In recent years this cemetery has become a place Jews fear to visit the graves of their loved ones because of Arab attacks. Jewish tombstones are regularly smashed or desecrated by Arabs. But now it is filled to overflowing as Rachel Weiss goes to sleep forever with her children-Netanel, 3; Rafael, 2; Ephraim, 10 months.

Yitzhak Shamir and Shimon Peres express their "horror" and their confidence that the security forces will catch the murderers. The Dream, as produced by the Shamirs and the Peres'. And these are only the murders. The daily life of Jews in the liberated areas of Judea-Samaria-Gaza has become an ongoing hell as the army under the insanity of the political line that the Israeli

authorities have decreed, has abdicated control of most of the area.

Except for the main roads and the major cities and towns, and except when there is a major disturbance on the part of the Arabs, the army's policy is to turn a blind eye to what is happening.

And so, on February 22, 1989, the village of Mazraa Sharkiya, near Ramallah, openly celebrated the 20th anniversary of the terrorist Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DFLP). Here is how the Jerusalem Post (February 23, 1989) described it:

Mazraa Sharkiya, a hilltop village with a population of some 3,000, yesterday looked like an independent hamlet expecting a state visit. Rows of Palestinian and DFLP flags decorated telephone poles, and the local mosque is festooned with scores of plastic pennants, topped by a huge banner flying from the minaret. Buildings were plastered with pictures of DFLP leader Nayef Hawatmeh, and movement leaders killed abroad and in the territories. There were also pictures of Yasser Arafat and his assassinated deputy. Abu Jihad, and a copy of the latest leaflet issued by the underground leadership of the uprising.

Walls were covered with layer upon layer of nationalist graffiti, including stenciled emblems of Fatah (rifles crossed over a grenade), the Marxist DFLP (a red star) and the Communist Party (hammer and sickle). One slogan marked the DFLP'S 20th anniversary in purple prose: "Twenty stars in the skies of our homeland, twenty roses on the bosom of our Palestinian state"

At the appointed hour, a formation of khaki-clad, masked youths marched out of the alleys, their leader keeping time with a whistle. They were preceded by a uniformed youth who filmed the march with a video camera. The youths carried Palestinian flags, and marched behind a DFLP banner and a large Palestinian flag. The DFLP flag bore a red star and the words: "The legacy of the martyrs is to continue the uprising. Victory to the intifada. Glory to the Democratic Front." The youth's masks were red, green, black and white-the Palestinians' national colors.

Crowds of young men chanting slogans followed the marching youths, and behind them walked women, mothers with children, and girls, chanting their own refrain: "With blood and spirit we will redeem you, Palestine."

At a whistled signal the uniformed youths ran off in single file. The gathering broke up-a demonstration that remained peaceful because the army stayed away.

"Because the army stayed away" Haplessly groping for some way to deal with the Arab uprising in the face of an unwillingness to do what must be done, the army resorts on the one hand to public relations statements concerning how the intifada is dying down, and on the other to giving almost absolute latitude to most of the territories. A de facto Palestine is arising in the villages and small towns that the army has declared to be out of bounds for itself. And with it comes into being a young generation of Arabs who will never again be daunted by the Israelis, while at the same time, those areas become more and more verboten to Jews, more dangerous to Jews, and more and more Judenrein.

The infifada is dying down? Nonsense!

What was last year, news, headlines and intolerable-Jews and Jewish cars being stoned regularly now becomes the norm and the stains quo. It is not that less Jews are being attacked, but rather that the army and the authorities now accept it as a common occurrence. It is not that the Arabs have quieted down, but that most of the areas have been quietly ceded to them. And as Jews are attacked, the Arabs grow bolder and as the Arabs grow bolder more Jews are

attacked or simply abandon the area to the Arabs.

And so, on December 17, 1988, open violence against the army erupted in Shchem to a degree not seen since 1967. The army was forced to throw hundreds of soldiers into the city and a mini-war broke out with shooting and firing taking place on a scale not seen since the Six Day War. The Israeli authorities had eaten sour grapes and their army children's teeth were set on edge. The fear and awe of the army were gone. but their demise was not due to Arab murder, but rather Jewish suicide, The hapless Jewish authorities had destroyed the mystique of the army and the Arabs were quick to react.

As part of the confused decision to pull out of most of the areas, (a major reason for the "ebbing of the intifada"), the army in March, 1989, pulled out of an outpost at the refugee camp of Shati, near Gaza. Hundreds of young Arabs poured out of the camp to rip the outpost apart with their bare hands. The building which was six stories high, became a target of Arabs who tore it down, story by story shouting: "Slaughter the Jews! The army will never come back here again, this is our victory! We have driven out the army!" Not a soldier was to be seen.

And on February 1, 1988, the newspaper Ha'Aretz carried an article under the heading: "YOUTH IN THE CASBAH OF SHCHEM, BOAST: JEWS NO LONGER ENTER HERE."

The reporter, Uri Nir, reported that young Arabs told him: "We have succeeded in frightening the Jews and driving them from here. Here Palestinian independence is being realized" And in the words of an older Arab: "This is a real war between civilians and youth who are not afraid. This is a second Beirut."

On April 11, 1987 a firebomb was thrown into a car driven by the Moses family from Alpehi Menashe. The mother, Ofra, pregnant, was burned to death and her five-year-old son, Tal lingered for three months before passing away (He joined eight-year-old Rami Chaba, from the nearby settlement of Eilon Moreh, whose body was found near his home, his face smashed to pieces by a rock.)

On August 6, 1987, a firebomb was thrown into the car of the Regev family from the same settlement, severely burning the wife and husband. Literally tens of attacks on vehicles driven by resi-dents of Alpehi Menashe take place every month, as well as one hundred and more attacks on vehicles of Jews from the other settlements. The army is impotent; it fails to report even half of the attacks (and this is a conservative figure) and gives little or no protection to the Jewish settlers.

Jews are attacked and injured every day.

On September 28, 1988: The Likud, major architect of the nightmare of the intifada, in chutzpah that so symbolizes Israeli au-thorities, announced a tour of the Shchem area. The tour was boldly called 'Operation Life' and was meant to show how foolish it is to worry about traveling (in the territories), As a caravan passed the Arab village of Beita, stones came crushing against the buses. Shoshana Grady 75, was injured. She waited several hours before being treated at the hospital, since the Likud organizers forgot to bring first aid equipment.

September 25, 1988 Worshippers leave the Hebron synagogue Avraham Avinu when they are attacked by Arabs. Stones hit 33-year-old Dani Izmi in the head. Hebron Jews are a different breed so they pick up stones and pelt the Arabs back. The army intervenes.

October 4, 1988. The police arrest Arabs from Akabat Jabar for burning down the packing factory of the Vered Yericho settlement. It is also announced that a few days earlier, Arabs penetrated the Gaza Strip settlement of Ganei Tal and destroyed hundreds of thousands of shekels worth of computer equipment.

October 15, 1988: David Hilwai, 56, a water carrier from Afula, is stabbed in the neck and back by Arabs in Jenin. He tells the press (Maariv, October 16): "Tens of Arabs surrounded me and I heard some of them saying: 'Slaughter him!' I said to them in Arabic: 'Get away from here,' and ran for about 30 meters. They jumped on me with axes and knives and stabbed me in the back and in the neck. I felt I was immersed in blood."

Question: The Jew had a revolver. Why did he not use it?

Answer: You know the answer.

One of the most common Arab tactics is to block a road with stones, thus forcing the car to stop. At that point, Arabs lying in wait, attack the car with rocks. Such a thing led on March 4, 1989 to the wounding of a little child near the settlement of Eynav.

And then there is the stabbing of Gadi Amzaleg, 25, a reserve soldier on duty in Bethlehem. On March 12, 1989, he is on patrol in a Bethlehem square where the soldiers see that the Bethlehem cinema has been decorated with Palestinian flags. Calling to a youth standing nearby he tells him to identify himself. The youth walks over, holding a cardboard box and as he nears, takes a kitchen knife out of it and stabs the soldier.

What is most important to note about this incident is the boldness and brazenness of the Arabs. Such an incident simply would have been unthinkable just a few years ago. The Arabs would have been just too frightened. And that is the point. They are no longer frightened. That is why they attack soldiers and army vehicles without fear. That is why on March 21, 1989, an army officer, Ian Ohana, 22, was wounded in the head by stones thrown at his army vehicle. He was the fifth soldier wounded in the Gaza Strip within two days. And that is why three soldiers were seriously wounded by rocks that struck them in the head, on April 6, 1989. And that is why on August 7, 1989, an officer was burned by a firebomb thrown into his jeep on patrol in Shchem.

From nightmare to Dream to nightmare. But whereas the original nightmare was a thing Jews could do nothing about—it was the exile of the gentiles—this present one, Jews have brought on themselves. By their pathetic, confused, bungling, hapless policy of no policy the Israeli authorities have brought tragedy on their people. Arabs are simply no longer afraid. It is the Jews who are afraid, and we have come full cycle.

The most fundamental obligation of government—the source of its legitimacy and right to rule over people—is its responsibility to guarantee the lives and safety of its citizens. If it either cannot or will not fulfill that obligation, it loses the loss of its moral and legal right of authority.

The process by which a magnificent-Divine!-dream of 1900 years is turned, daily into a growing nightmare, cannot continue. For if we persist in this way the Jewish State faces horror of horrors—awesome national tragedy. It cannot continue, and it will not, and the only question is will the process of disintegration and collapse be prevented by revolution or by referendum?

Chapter 4: Within the Green Line

The intifada long ago crossed the so-called "Green Line," the area of pre-1967 Israel, the area that is the "official" State of Israel following the betrayal by Menachem Begin and the Likud of their from-time-immemorial pledge to annex the territories of Judea-Samaria-Gaza. The intifada long ago crossed the "Green Line" because, for the Arabs of Israel, not to mention the Arabs of the territories who work and travel freely into Israel, there is no "Green Line." As far as they are concerned, all of the land is "Palestine."

On June 25, 1989, the newspaper Davar reported a story that by any normal standard would have to be considered incredible. According to the paper, the Rambam Hospital in Haifa, has been the scene of an ongoing and serious process of deliberate sabo-tage. The police are convinced that the perpetrators are Arabs who work there. According to the authorities, among the acts of sabo-tage have been the placing of urine into intravenous injection bottles; the cutting of a computer cable in the children's department in the Ophthalmology department; the cutting of a copper cable in the children's department that led to a gas leak; the loosening of screws that led to an overflow of a toilet pipe in the X-ray room; the stuffing of sinks that led to flooding of floors; the puncturing of tires of Jewish cars in the parking lot, and anti-Jewish slogans in the restrooms. A week later, (July 2), the paper reported that all the electrical equipment in the sterilization laboratory of the hospital had been activated deliberately in order to create an electrical short circuit.

Rambam is the hospital to which severely wounded soldiers in Lebanon and the north are helicoptered immediately and some 450(!) Arabs work there. What makes the story grotesque is the police claim that for months the hospital administration attempted to cover up the events, and even after the story broke, the Assistant Director of the hospital, Zvi ben Yishai, declared that the hospital would not change its policy of hiring Arabs since "there is no reason to suspect that they are involved" in the incidents. With the revelations of the events at Rambam Hospital, yet another Haifa hospital, Carmel, announced that it had filed charges with the police concerning deliberate sabotage in its Women's Department. But surely, the strangest story related to this came from yet another hospital, Hadassa, in Jerusalem, long a target of sabotage, which, again, as much as possible was also suppressed. For example, in 1988, a blaze in the laundry room caused 200 patients to have to be evacuated and it took five fire trucks and some 20 firefighters to extinguish the blaze that shut down the building's electrical system. The Jerusalem Post carried the following item (July 21, 1989):

Sha'are Zedek Hospital administrators have asked the facility's new chief halachic authority for a ruling on how to deal with the possible danger of sabotage by Arab workers on the Sabbath.

Many of the weekend staffers at the religiously observant hospital are Arabs. Several incidents of sabotage and vandalism have been reported in hospitals around the country since the intifada began.

It was not clear what was supposed to be done about the fact that hundreds of Arab workers also work at the hospital on Sundays, Mondays, Tuesdays.

In early August 1989, the local Beersheba weekly Kol-Bi, carried an article that accused Arab workers in the south of Israel of deliberate sabotage in factories, hotels and small industrial establishments. A factory that produces towels in Dimona suspected sabotage and went to a private investigator rather than the police. (That fact alone speaks volumes for the conviction of most Jews in Israel that the authorities either cannot or will not act.) A thorough investigation, that included hidden cameras, revealed the following:

*Arabs in the Dimona factory and textile plants tear the threads and place foreign objects into the dyes and the machines. The investigators also caught Arabs urinating into the dyes and placing sand in the machines. (Incidentally several incidents involving Arabs urinating in food have been reported, including at one expensive Tel Aviv restaurant.)

*In hotels, for example the one in Ein Bokek, Arab workers stuffed pipes and toilets with paper and towels and caused serious flooding and damage in the tens of thousands of dollars.

*Other hotels saw Arabs placing various foreign objects in the food such as matches and hair (including that of mice). Similar pollution of food occurred at a Beersheba factory producing baby food.

The story was picked up by the newspaper Ha'Aretz (August 8, 1989) but should have surprised no one. In early December 1988, a flyer distributed in East Jerusalem and other cities in the territories called upon workers to sabotage machinery and equipment in Jewish factories and establishments. The flyer, as reported in the weekly Yerushalayim, (December 9, 1988) listed specific and precise ways to commit sabotage. Long before this, however, factories in the Kiryat Gat area reported that inestimable damage was done regularly by Arab workers. That this had not led to wholesale dismissal of Arabs and the hiring of Jews at decent wages, speaks volumes for greed.

The intifada has long since crossed over into the State of Israel. The newspaper Maariv (June 29, 1988), in a full-page story titled, INTIFADA IN TEL AVIV, declared that in one month alone (June 12- July 24, 1988), no less than 32 crimes based on Arab nationalism took place in Tel Aviv, heartland of Israeli culture and business. The most dramatic was, of course, the dropping of four firebombs from the roof of Dizengoff center, the hub of Tel Aviv nightlife and shopping. Other incidents included the injuring of several Jews when stones hit them as they were on the way to a wedding on Hamasger Street and a train that was stoned as it traveled past the fair grounds in prosperous north Tel Aviv.

The Intifada is inside the Jewish State and here is a partial, very partial, list of events:

*August 2, 1989: A firebomb is thrown at a vehicle traveling in the Jezreel Valley deep in the heartland of Israel. At the same time, firefighters discover three ready-to-use firebombs while attempting to extinguish a blaze that destroys 10 dunams of brushland near Migdal Ha'Emek.

*July 23, 1989: 34-year-old taxi driver Yossi Hakiashvilli, stabbed three times in the neck and back by two Arabs who have gotten into his cab in Beersheba.

*July 17, 1989: A captain in the army reserves and commander of a company is involved in an automobile accident at the corner of Bialik and Hechalutz streets in Haifa. The other car is driven by an Arab from Haifa who rushes to get his family. Four Arabs then attack the Jew in broad daylight. The victim, Doron Stern, 29, tells the news service Itim: "I fought to block the intifada during a long period of army service in Judea and Samaria. But the real intifada I felt in the heart of Haifa." What can one say?

*June 18, 1989: Five young Arabs charged with burning a syn-agogue in lower Haifa are released on 2,000 shekels bail. The Arabs are all Israeli citizens from Haifa and Jasar Zarka. This is the second time the synagogue has been torched. It should be noted that the synagogue is in the Halissa section of Haifa, where Jews live in deadly fear and most do not leave their homes at night. In 1987, on Yom Kippur, Arabs stoned the synagogue.

*June 4, 1989: A woman soldier, Smadar Benlulu, escapes an attempt on the part of two Arabs to push her into a car near Moshav Paamei Tashaz, in the Negev. The police praised her "quick thinking and courage..."

*June 4, 1989: The Dean of the Technion in Haifa revokes a decision to expel four Arab students who held a wild party in the dormitories on the eve of Memorial Day for Israeli fallen soldiers. The students sang Arab nationalist songs and loudly disrupted the atmosphere of sadness of the day. The decision is bitterly attacked by the Jewish students.

*May 14, 1989. An interesting day in the Valley of Jezree!. Near Kibbutz Beit Alfa, an Arab is asked to show his identity card. He opens fire on two policeman who are wounded but who shoot him. Earlier, a tractor-driver near Moshav Sde Ilan is robbed and a woman from Kibbutz Hazorea raped by an Arab. That same day, police arrest eight Israeli Arabs from Jatt Village in Wadi Ara for printing anti-Israeli material, flying PLO flags and painting anti-Israeli slogans on buildings.

*May 2, 1989 A firebomb is thrown into the courtyard of a Jewish family in Dimona. *April 30, 1989 A terror bomb exploded on Ramat Gan's Jabotinsky Street near a bus stop.

*April 16, 1989: A bomb explodes in the Pardes Katz area of Bnei Brak. That same day, a Tel Aviv pub on Allenby Street is damaged as Arabs open a gas balloon and light a fire near it. On the wall of the damaged pub is written "VENGEANCE FOR ABU JIHAD." (The PLO leader assassinated by the Israelis in 1988).

*April 15, 1989: A bomb is discovered inside a water pumping station near Moshav Ramon, in the Afula area. Containing 16 kilos of TNT, had it exploded it would have caused thousands of humans of land to be flooded. Says Avraham Yariv, head of the Gilboa regional council: "The villains who did it knew exactly what they were doing. What worries me is that they sit in Jenin and pick the targets. Yesterday it was a water pump; tomorrow they might decide to blow up a house in one of the moshavim. True. Question: Why are they allowed to sit in Jenin? That day, 80 young olive trees belonging to Moshav Mei Ami were uprooted. The Arabs also tried to burn down a nearby pine forest. Mei Ami, the lone Jewish settlement in the Wadi Ara area of Israel, has suffered Arab terror and sabotage for years.

*April 9, 1989: A minibus carrying young children is hit by a rock on the main Tel Aviv-Haifa road- It is not as serious as the firebomb thrown the previous year at a children's school bus on the Wadi Ara road.

*April 6, 1989: The police release the names of two Israeli Arabs from the Western Galilee who, along with an Arab from Jenin, are responsible for burning down a restaurant in Nahariya, in the northern of Israel. The two sought to become members of the Moslem Brotherhood and this was their initiation. All three Arabs live in the Jewish city of Nahariya.

*Question: Why do the authorities allow Arabs to live in Jewish areas and thus give them an open hand and door to attack Jews?

*On March 22, 1989, 83 trees in Kibbutz Lotam in western Galilee were uprooted. They were planted a few weeks earlier to replace others burned down in 1988 by Arabs. The just-uprooted trees were part of a pledge by the Jewish National Fund as stated by its President, Joseph Sternstein:

"The JNF is determined that it will not permit arsonists who want to wreak havoc upon helpless and innocent trees to carry the day"

In 1988, 1,200 fires were set by Arabs that destroyed 1.2 million trees and the JNF pledged to plant three for every one that was destroyed. That Jews would give money to replace trees that were destroyed with trees that will be destroyed again, is a thing to contemplate.

The burning down of Jewish forests and fields is a national catastrophe and there is nothing the JNF can do except convince Jews to literally burn more of their money For as long as the Arabs are in the country they will burn down Jewish trees. In the words of leftist writer Dani Tzidkoni (Davar August 6, 1989):

"Knowing how much the forest is dear to their enemies (the Israelis), they (the Arabs) saw in an attack on it. another target in their struggle against us."

This is why Kennedy Forest, near Jerusalem's Kiryat Menachem neighborhood, is the scene of arson that burns 70 pine trees on April 18, 1989. And just one week later, the entire forest is engulfed in flames that started at several locations simultaneously

And this is why the beginning of the summer of 1989 sees vast areas of forestland in the Golan, the Galilee, Mount Tabor and the Judean Hills go up in flames.

The raging inferno that destroyed over 500 dunams of the Nahal Sorek Nature reserve on August 7, 1989 is only a natural link in the same chain of Arab hate of Israel that led to the destruction on May 26, 1988 of 20,000 dunams of forest and pasture land in nearby Ala Valley. At the time a resident says: "The flames were gigantic, the chicken coops burned like torches, trees were destroyed; it was terrible." And it will not stop-as long as those who burn them remain.

The most fundamental obligation of government-the source of its legitimacy and right to rule over people-is its responsibility to guarantee the lives and safety of its citizens. If it either cannot or will not fulfill that obligation, it faces the loss of its moral and legal right of authority.

Chapter 5: The Arabs of Israel

"There must be a police station in every Israeli Arab village if growing Arab nationalism is to be effectively countered."

These were not the words of some Arab-hating racist, but of the chief of the Israeli police, Davis Kraus testifying before the Knesset Interior Committee on August 1, 1989. And Interior Committee chairman Yehoshua Matza adds, "Israeli Arabs must be warned that if they continue their militant behavior they will bring on themselves a repetition of the 1948 tragedy." Strange words for leaders of an Israel that boasts, regularly of Jewish-Arab coexistence.

Or consider what happened at a farewell party for the outgoing head of the Southern Command, Major General Yitzhak Mordechai, on July 30, 1989. In the presence of Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin, Chief of Staff Dan Shomron and other senior military officers, Haya Samir is invited to sing for the patricians. Samir, the only female Arab who ever served in the army and who was the soloist for the Southern Command entertainment troupe, is General Mordechai's favorite singer. And so, the generals and officers and Israeli Jews sit back to enjoy their favorite Arab when she bursts into what the papers will later call, "The Intifada song." In it she speaks of "fate-stricken people," and "prisoners for execution" and "hungry for justice and chewing hate."

A number of officers walked out while later a senior officer says: "I am shocked..."

Shocked. I too, but I am shocked that the Israeli general is shocked. For that speaks volumes for the deliberate blindness and refusal to understand anything about the Arabs of Israel. It symbolizes the "plantation" Sabra who smiles tolerantly at "his" Arabs and proclaims them happy content and loyal. One gapes, open-mouthed in awe, at the refusal to understand that the Arabs of Israel hate the Jews who, they believe, stole the land from them. One is stupefied at the inability or unwillingness to grasp the immutable, unbridgeable gap and contradiction between the very concept of a Jewish state and political equality for Arabs within it.

As a corollary to the myth that a Jewish State can also be a western democratic one, giving non-Jews exactly the kinds of equal rights possessed by Jews, is the delusion of "coexistence between Jews and Arabs." And as part and parcel, of that picture of smiling, handholding Jews and Arabs, is the fiction of Arab loyalty to the State of Israel as transcending their Arabism. Nonsense!

It is not Arabs of the liberated lands, Judea-Samaria-Gaza, who are the ultimate threat, who are the essence of the problem. For those who call themselves "Palestinians," are not to be found only in the territories. More than 750,000 of them live within the State of Israel-the Jewish State-itself They are the Arabs of Israel, who see themselves as "Palestinians," who identify with the "Palestinian" people, who hate Israel and who see it as a robber, alien state that sits on a large part of what to them is really "Palestine."

The Arabs of Israel are the reality of the worst nightmare imaginable for the liberal Jews of Israel (and the world). They exemplify the immutable contradiction between Zionism and a Jewish State on the one hand, and Western democracy and political equality on the other. The Arabs of Israel represent the most terrible threat to the intellectual stability of the western, modern Jew who so desperately created the myth in which he so desperately needed to believe, the myth that Judaism and democracy, Jewishness and Western values, are the same, are compatible, walk hand-in-hand. Of course that is nonsense, and Judaism and the very concept of a Jewish state differ radically totally, from Western civilization's concept of democracy with its absolute political equality for all, regardless of religion or national background. And of course, that is horrible and a nightmare for the Western Jew. For if it is true that there is a contradiction here, then he must choose-and that is too unbearable. If it is true, then his life has been one huge intellectual lie-and that is anguish too awful to contemplate.

Sad. But it changes nothing. The truth remains. There is a basic, substantive contradiction between Judaism and Western culture, in entire areas of major ideas. And most specifically there is an unbridgeable conflict, utter contradiction, between Zionism, per Se, be it of the most secular or Left kind, and Western democracy.

Modern day Zionism arose in order to create a Jewish State. And a Jewish State was the dream of a people that had suffered unspeakable horrors and persecution as a minority in every land, and who now sought to cast off the role. The Jew no longer trusted the gentile, no longer sought tolerance for himself as a minority. He wished to be a majority in his own land. That is Zionism, that is the concept of a Jewish State: A state in which the Jew will always control his own destiny will always be the captain of his own ship. And that can only be when and if the Jew is the majority. And so Zionism demands a permanent Jewish majority.

But that is not Western democracy. Western democracy is based on the concept of the equality of all people, of the right of one person to one vote-regardless of his ethnic, national or religious origin. According to Western democracy if the Arab will sit peacefully and quietly and become the majority, he has the absolute right to vote to shape the country in the way he sees fit, just as the Jews did when they were the majority. He can vote to change the character of Israel from a Jewish state to a Palestinian state, just as the Jews originally characterized it in the manner they saw fit. Under Zionism, of course, this is anathema. There can never be any change in Israel as the Jewish State, no matter what. It can never belong to the Arabs; it belongs to the Jewish people, including those of Boston.

Is there a contradiction between Zionism, Judaism, and a Jewish state on the one hand and Western democracy and equality for all people, on the other? Of course. And it is that terrible contradiction which can never be solved, that drives the schizophrenic Jew into spiritual agony and mental torture.

For years, he attempted to deceive the world, other Jews, himself into believing that democracy was compatible with Zionism. As long as the Arabs were few in numbers and backward, he succeeded. But that is long since gone. The Arab birthrate today is enormous. The mad Jew pays from National Insurance for each Arab baby born (until the age of 18, and one does not know whether to laugh or cry upon reading of the Israeli Bedouin Arab, father of 48 children-from six wives-who collects 48 checks every month from suicidal Jews).

Meanwhile, Jews have 30,000 abortions a year and, in general, secular Jews have less children than required to regenerate the population, the average in North Tel Aviv's liberal Ashkenazi area being 1.5 dogs to each child. And one adds to that the fact that Aliyah (immigration to Israel) is a total failure, a myth, with few Jews coming to Israel and many more leaving. (Indeed, the last weapon of Zionism is the US immigration quota. If the gates of America would be opened, hundreds of thousands of Israelis would be clamoring to enter the Golden Land. So much for the success of secular Zionism.)

The question is, what will happen in five years? Ten years? Twenty years? 1-how many Arabs will be living inside the Jewish State of Israel? I-low long will it remain the Jewish State of Israel? Know that already today the Galilee has a majority of Arabs. When one travels in the western Galilee, he is in an area that is more than 70% Arab. When one travels on the Acre-Safed road, except for Carmiel, there is not one sizeable Jewish settlement. The western Galilee is "Palestine". Indeed, northern Israel, touching on Lebanon and Syria, is Israel's budding Northern Ireland.

And what of the Triangle? Just behind the Israeli coastal plain, wherein live nearly Mo-third of Israel's Jews, lies the Triangle. Just 10 kilometers from the coast, behind such Jewish cities as Petach Tikva and Kfar Saba and Ra'anana and Netanya and Herzylia, lies a total Arab mass. Towns and cities like Baka-al-Garbia, Tayba, Tira, Kfar Kassem, the Wadi Ara area with its city of Um-al-Faham (where the fundamentalist Moslems hold sway). More than 200,000 Israeli Arabs controlling the hinterland of the Israeli coast line.

And so, the fraud of the frenetic liberal-left axis. "Give up the territories so that we can have a Jewish Israel." Aside from the obvious question to this "racist," liberal-left cry, i.e.: "In a democratic humanist's mind, what is the difference if the Arabs or Jews are the majority," there is also the fraud that is blatant. Assuming that we do give up Judea-Samaria-Gaza-what does that gain us? Twenty years? For by then the Galilee and the Triangle will pose the same demographic threat as the territories do today. What do we do then? Give up the Galilee?

The Triangle? Shall we be left with a Jewish state on both sides of Tel Aviv's Yarkon River? The Arabs of Israel wait, give birth, and hate. Let us end the nonsense of the myth of the "good Arab".

Let us end the contempt of the Jew for the Arab that lies in the very question: "But are there no good Arabs?" How much contempt and shallowness lie in that absurd question! 'Are there no good Arabs?' Of course, there are good Arabs. They are all good Arabs. The problem with liberal and leftist Jews is that they have not the slightest idea what a "good" Arab is. A good Arab is exactly like a good Jew. A good Jew is one who believes that Israel belongs to the Jewish people. Now you know what a good Arab is; yes, one who believes that it belongs to the Arab people. Why is the liberal Jew so obtuse? Clearly because he is too terrified to see the truth.

For years we deceived ourselves. For years, Jews would raise money at breakfasts, luncheons, dinners or suppers, by listening to some UJA or JNF functionary (or perhaps even an Israeli Cabinet Minister) proclaim: "We came to the land, found a desert and turned it into a garden" And Jews choked up and wrote checks in honor of the chalutzim (the pioneers) and others who drained swamps and cleared the wasteland. But if one were to attempt to tell that to an Arab, the latter would surely reply: "True. But it was my desert. Now it is your garden."

How unpleasant, how unsettling, how agonizing to even semi-thinkers! But true. For years, the contempt of Jewish leftists and liberals for Arabs was stupefying. The myth of the happy Israeli Arab, so much better off than the Arabs of Iraq or Egypt. We have given them electricity and indoor toilets and now they sit happily Grateful. Loving us. What contempt! Is there one person with a shred of respect for himself who believes that Arabs will trade their national pride for electricity or indoor toilets? Not by bread alone does the Arab live. He is proud; he is a nationalist: and he believes that Jews are thieves-who stole his land. Is there one normal Jew who believes that there is even one Israeli Arab who enjoys living in a state that is called the "Jewish State?" The number of Arabs who enjoy that is exactly equal to the number of Jews who would enjoy it if America ever became a Christian State.

And is there even one Arab who enjoys singing his national anthem, Hatikva, with the words, "the soul of a Jew yearning"? How this speaks to him! And when it concludes with, "the hope of 2,000 years," does the Arab break down and remember how his ancestors waited 2,000 years

for the Jew to come home? Or does Hatikva mean "the dream", and it was certainly that for the Jews. But for the Arab it was a nightmare. And on Independence Day in Israel, do Arabs rush happily into the streets to celebrate their defeat?

And yet, the terrified and shallow Jew persisted all these years in wishing to believe this nonsense. Either because he was too shallow to see the truth, or too frightened to wish to face it.

To believe that two people, both of whom claim title, ownership and sovereignty over a land, can live together without violence and bloodshed, is to fly in the face of reality. All over the world national, ethnic, religious and language differences divide peoples and lead to war and bloodshed. In Northern Ireland, in Sri Lanka, in India, in Bulgaria, in Iraq, in the Philippines, in Senegal, in Tibet, in Spain, in Corsica, in Belgium, in tens of other places throughout the world, people who differ only in ethnicity or religion or language, are at each other's throats. But liberals and leftists would have us believe that Jews and Arabs who differ in religion, national background, language, culture-everything-can share the land. Jews can live with Arabs who cannot live with themselves - Madness!

The truth is that the Arabs of Israel call themselves Palestinians, hate Israel, and wait for the moment of truth. Not only is their population growth enormous (even as entire cities like Acre, Jaffa, Lydda, Ramle, lower Haifa, become Arab) but thanks to the mad Jew, the Arab today is qualitatively different from his father and grandfather. From 110,000 mostly illiterate Arabs in 1948, thanks to the insanity of the Jews, there are now 750,000 educated ones. And one listens to the Cabinet Ministers and Knesset Members boasting of the educational progress they have given the Arabs, and we know that we are in the hands of madmen. We are proud that we have educated them? We beam at the thought that 4,000 Arabs study in Israel's universities? Have we become total cretins? Who will be leaders of the PLO tomorrow if not the educated ones? Is it not obvious to all but the dumbest of dullards that the revolution never comes from the numb and the dumb but rather from the educated? With our own hands and money (from the American Friends of Hebrew University or Tel Aviv U. or Haifa U. or Ben Gurion U.) we are creating the intellectual and political leaders who will attempt to wipe us out, Mind-boggling!

Consider the 'loyalty' and kinship of the Israeli Arabs during the brief period of the intifada, Here are a few, a very few, exam-ples:

July 31, 1989: Arab Knesset Member Abdel Wahab Darawsha protests the behavior of Israeli soldiers during a visit to an Arab village by Arabs and Jewish leftists opposed to "occupation." When the group arrives, with TV in tow, Arab youths begin attack-ing soldiers with rocks. The soldiers fire rubber bullets. Darawsha protests the behavior of the troops. He also visits Arabs wounded by Israeli soldiers and hospitalized in East Jerusalem's Al Mukased Hospital.

This is the same Arab Knesset Member who attempted, in 1985, to participate in the PLO conference in Jordan, traveling to Cyprus in order to avoid being stopped by Israeli security forces. He has openly supported the intifada, along with every other Arab Knesset member, including Communist Party Knesset member Tewfik Ziad who, after the Egyptians crossed the Suez Canal in the Yom Kippur War of 1973, wrote a poem praising the Egyptian tanks that crushed the bodies of the Israeli soldiers.

That same day a Border Police patrol is attacked by Israeli Bedouins near Carmiel, in the Galilee. The police attempt to arrest some of the Bedouins for writing on the walls, "Palestine is Arab" and waving a PLO flag. The Bedouins, of course, as all UJA diners are told, are loyal to Israel.

A long article in Ha'Aretz (July 28, 1989) is titled "AN EXTREMIST WIND IN THE TENT FLAPS." The writer, Uzi Bensiman, quotes the head of the Negev police command, Chaim Ben Vion, who says that the future for Jewish-Bedouin relations "is not rosy" He points out that the loyal Bedouins have shown strong support for the intifada and that at least 130 incidents of

Bedouin-Arab nationalism have taken place, including stone throwing, burning of Israeli flags and attacks on vehicles.

July 25, 1989: It is announced that the police have uncovered a PLO cell made up of Israeli Arabs living in Jaffa.

July 21, 1989: The Jerusalem Post's David Rudge writes about Israeli Arab children, and their game of war between the "soldiers" and the "heroes" Rewrites:

"It is just one outward sign of the effects the uprising in the territories is having on Israeli Arab children and youths. Other, more serious, manifestations can be found in police statistics, which show an increase in "nationalistically-motivated" offences, especially in the north.

"These range in severity from PLO slogan-daubing and flag-raising, to damaging property, barricading roads, hurling stones, and more serious still, petrol bomb and hand grenade attacks.

"According to police, there has been a 10 per cent rise in such offences so far this year in the northern district compared to the same period last year Residents of the territories, especially those whose villages adjoin the Green Line, were apparently involved in many of the incidents. The perpetrators in other cases were Israeli Arabs, predominantly youths.

"The child in the territories has become the symbol of the revolution of the rocks, He is the new Palestinian hero," said al-Haj, chairman of the follow-up committee on Arab education for the national committee of Arab local councils."

July 23, 1989: The newspaper Davar tells of PLO magazines and weeklies received by Israeli Arab national and local leaders in the Galilee through the mail and without any interference by the government. The Ministry of Defense says that "at this stage" it has no knowledge of any subversive literature received by Galilee Arabs.

July 23, 1989: The police uncover a number of Israeli Arab children's intifada Summer camps, around the Galilee city of Shfaram. One is run by the Sons of the Village movement and another by the Communist party. A few days earlier, a similar camp run by Druze in the Golan was uncovered near the Druze village of Majdal Sams.

The Jerusalem Post (July 24, 1989) writes

"In the latest incident, near Shfaram yesterday, police discovered a placard on which the Palestinian covenant was written in Arabic, said Galilee district police spokesman Chief Inspector Shlomo Morad. Other placards contained newspaper cuttings relating to the intifada with photographs of Palestinian flags being raised by Keffiyeh-masked youths, he added- There were also slogans which read: "The Road to Liberty is Splashed with Blood," "The Intifada is the Decision of the People until Victory," and "If the Battle for a state is not a crime, then the World knows we are not criminals"

"Morad said police had received information that the day~ activities at the camp were concluded with the singing of the Palestinian anthem, Biladi, Biladi.

"Senior police officers say they view this latest phenomenon with 'grave concern.' 'It is potentially more serious than stone throwing incidents because there are long-term effects,' said superintendent Gideon Arbel, spokesman for the northern district. 'This amounts to teaching hatred to children at a very early age, without any attempt to promote peaceful solutions, and serves only to increase tension,' said Arbel. "

'Our aim is to investigate all alleged incidents of incitement to rebellion and bring the perpetrators to justice. This, however, is not as easy as with stone-throwers because there is no clear line between rebellion and what could be construed as a political line,' he said"

July 4, 1989: At a party for the local soccer team in the Israeli Arab town of Sakhnin, the guests sing PLO songs, including the "anthem," Biladi, Biladi, for which all persons present stand.

June 30, 1989: Four youths from the Israeli Arab city of Baka al-Garbiya are arrested for desecrating a Jewish cemetery near Hedera. Swastikas, PLO flags and anti-Israeli graffiti are found on the tombstones.

That same day, police chief Kraus addresses senior police officers in Jerusalem and says that there are 'signs" (sic) that the intifada's influence is reaching across the Green Line.

June 21, 1989: Two youths from the Israeli Arab village of Kabul in the western Galilee are arrested for stoning vehicles. That night, an Arab resident of Haifa runs through the center of the Hadar section of the city shouting: "Slaughter the Jews" and smashing car windows.

June 18, 1989: Moslem imams, religious leaders, in a number of Israeli Arab villages, refuse to conduct rites for a Bedouin scout who was killed by Palestinian infiltrators along the northern border. Among them is the Sheikh of Arab Shibli. The soldier's family is told that he was a traitor who did not deserve a Moslem rite.

An important point. Along with the powerful growth of support for the PLO, has come another phenomenon. The extraordinary rise of a powerful Fundamentalist Moslem movement, yet another expression of Arab nationalism.

March 1, 1989: The Moslems win a smashing victory in the second largest Israel Arab city in Israel, Um-al-Faham, taking 11 of the 15 council seats and electing a fundamentalist Moslem mayor with 76% of the vote.

The Moslems are bitterly anti-Israel and anti-Jewish. They combine fervent anti-Zionist nationalism with the even more fervent Islamic creed. That the Arab youth of Israel are undergoing an Islamic revival is admitted by one and all.

December 26, 1989: A study reveals a sharp rise in the number of Israeli Arab youth who openly admit that they are prepared to use force as 'protest."

Israeli Arabs have regularly been arrested for being members of terrorist groups- For example:

Mustafa Jbarin of Tim al-Faham is accused of being a member of Fatah.

Mahmud Matzwara of Baka al-Gharbia is charged with spying. An Ahmed Jibril-linked terrorist group comprising seven Israeli Arabs is uncovered. The cell is led by Mahdoumi Bassam, a 35-year-old journalist from Nazareth. Bassam was allegedly recruited by his brother Nabil who was released from prison in the infamous 1985 prisoner exchange.

Another member of the cell is Sheikh Mohammed Abu Tor, known to be an Islamic fundamentalist leader in Jerusalem. The group was apparently planning a series of attacks to launch an intifada in Israel. None of this should shock anyone.

None of this is new. Before there was an "intifada", there as was an Israeli Arab who hated Israel and the very concept of a Zionist, and a Jewish State. Long before this "intifada" there was violence by Israeli Arabs against Jews in Israel, and hale and calls for the destruction of the Jewish State. If foolish Jews did not want to see or hear-we pay the price for that today

Nothing has changed. Consider:

May 28, 1976: The newspaper Maariv, presents a discussion with Israeli Arab teachers in the Israeli Arab town of Arabbe. Among the comments: "This land belongs to us and not to some Jew who comes from Russia. In the Yom Kippur War we were for our brothers (the Arabs)-how could it be different?"

And the comment by Na'ama Saud: Today I am in the minority. Who says that in the year 2,000 we Arabs will still be in the minority? Today, I accept the fact there is a Jewish state with an Arab minority. But when we are the majority I will not accept the fact of a Jewish state with an Arab majority."

Logical? Clear?

May 4, 1977: The newspaper Yediot Acharonot, tells of a wedding in the Israeli Arab village of Romana in the lower Galilee. The traditional singers and verses in honor of the bride and groom contain the following sentences:

We will slaughter the children of the Zionists.

We will trample with our feet on their Torah.

We are all fighters for freedom and liberation

The hundreds of guests applaud wildly.

June 3, 1979: Six thousand Israeli Arabs demonstrate at the Knesset. They have been brought in hundreds of buses from all over Israel. They shout: "The Galilee to the Arabs, Jews out! With blood and soul we will free you, Galilee."

Was anyone listening?

Chapter 6: Moving to the Verge

Israel moves to the verge of an explosion of violence on the part of Jews who are bitter, angry and deeply frightened. They are good Jews who do not wish to see such a frightening occurrence but who see a situation in which:

- 1) The government is either unwilling or unable to protect Jewish lives and property and yet lays rules for both security forces and civilians that make it impossible to protect themselves properly.
- 2) When after much suffering and patience, Jews "violate" the insane laws and fire back in self defense they are arrested, their weapons confiscated and, at times, they are put on trial.
- 3) This only increases the anger and frustration as the Arabs, understanding the situation, grow ever bolder and attack and kill more Jews.
- 4) This, in turn, leads to more and more Jews taking action on their own; either settlers attacking an Arab location from which a terror attack came, or urban crowds rioting after an attack or at a funeral.
- 5) This leads to bitter condemnation of the Jews by both the government and the liberal left, and a hardening of the police and judicial breakdown-including stiff sentences against Jews who

reacted to violence and to government impotency with violence of their own.

6) This leads to the growth of underground groups who escalate the violence qualitatively and quantitatively.

7) This leads to threats by the Left of counter measures by them and of civil war. This is not a scenario for the future. This is what has been happening over the past few years and what is occurring in Israel at this moment. Consider:

The headline in Yediot Ahoronot (December 20, 1988) read: **EVERYONE ASKS HIMSELF, WHEN WILL THE STONE HIT ME?** It was a story about the settlement of Ginot Shomron, a comfortable, relatively prosperous one that drew many Jews by advertising itself as being "five minutes from Kfar Saba," i.e. the Green Line in Israel. Within the previous year, however, life had become a nightmare for the settlement. Five residents injured seriously by rocks, and a daily riding of the gauntlet of Arab terror from the nearby Arab villages and orchards.

According to the secretary of the settlement, Moshe Basa: "One who says that the residents do not live in an atmosphere of fear, would miss the truth (sic). Our way of life has been disrupted. We are speaking about civilians who set up a settlement by govern-mental decision a settlement of 500 families."

And in the settlement of Alpehi Meriashe, also a constant target of attacks on its residents, there is bitterness, too. Again, Yediot Aharonot (November 10, 1988):

"The head of the council, Shlomo Katan pointed an accusing finger at Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin and Police Minister Chaim Bar Lev, who according to him, incorrectly read the map and the sad on-the-spot day-to-day and hour-to-hour reality.

"There is a new situation and the intifada has deepened within us. I believe that the lack of understanding of the authorities concerning what is happening around us, is a direct result of a mental dislocation from our area."

In frustration, after each attack on a Jew, settlers, at the begin-ning, would go out to protest, only to be met by army roadblocks and threats of arrest. They would return home even more frustrated, even more angry, bitter, frightened. Thus, this report in Ha'Aretz (January 27, 1989) following the wounding of a Ginot Shomron resident in the head:

"Some 30 residents of Ginot Shomron went out to the Kalkilya crossroads in order to protest the attack on Simmi Carson. The settlers planned to enter the (Arab) city. They were stopped by soldiers and for several hours, wandered about the area. Before dawn they returned to their homes."

Or the following report in the weekly, Yom Shishi (December 23, 1988): "On Monday, 15 of the heads of the settlers went to Kalkilya to protest over questions of security. They demanded a meeting with the Chief-of-Staff He did not arrive, but a senior officer did who asked them to leave since the area had been declared closed. After arguing and a threat by the officer that he would remove them by force, the settlers left."

The reality is that the army and the authorities ignore pleas, ignore warnings that Arabs are planning attacks and ignore reports of attacks on Jews except if they involve loss of life or serious injury.

Following a clash between Jews and Arabs at the Jewish settlement of Amatzia, the bitter residents speak to The Jerusalem Post (July 26, 1989). The settlement which is just inside Israel, within the Green Line, has been bothered by Arabs since the Six Day War. Writes The Post:

"One of the residents, who asked not to be identified, said the settlement's 30 families have been bothered by Arabs since before the Six Day War. All the moshav's fields are surrounded by a wire fence, he said, and Arab shepherds not only break the fences and let their sheep eat the crops, as they did on Monday, but also steal wire mesh from the fence..."

"Moshav Amatzia was established in 1957 by the Betar youth movement, idealists who dreamed about guarding the frontiers. Now most of the younger residents are thinking of leaving. We alerted the police many times since the intifada began that Arabs are causing us trouble, but no one paid attention. If not for yesterday's events the public still would not even know where moshav Amatzia is," said one."

One cannot overlook the fact that the resident who spoke to the press asked not to be identified. An almost natural instinct in a country in which people live in fear of reaction by the authorities.

The most grotesque twist of all, is the tying of settlers' hands and then the action taken against them when they act in self-defense beyond the stupid and irrational rules of the authorities. An interesting example of this, and of the fear of the Jew to use force even when attacked, is the case of Rafi Levi of Ariel.

Levi, on December 22, 1988, left the settlement of Ariel where he lives, on a bus driven by Avner Mutzpi. Levi's job was to protect the bus in case of attack. At the entrance to the Arab village, Marda, they were attacked by youths throwing stones. Rushing out, they apprehended four of them, when from the village dashed out tens of Arabs, screaming, cursing and throwing rocks. Now consider Levi's story bearing in mind that he was armed and that his job was to protect the bus:

One Arab, carrying a stone, tried to hit me in the head & I stopped him with both hands but was hit and slightly injured in the head, when another Arab, from behind, grabbed my throat with both his hands. With all my strength and with the butt of my weapon that I had in my hand, I succeeded in hitting him in the stomach and freeing myself. The Arab with the stone now jumped at me and I stopped him again, but I was hit in my forehead above the eyes. He then grabbed my gun belt and began to pull on it. I felt that my life was in danger and I cocked the weapon. Then I heard my friend the driver yelling that he was coming to help, so I un-cocked the weapon," (Maariv. December 23, 1988).

One hardly knows what to say. A man is given a gun and a job to protect a bus and presumably Jewish lives on it. Most presumably his own. He has the weapon. How does he allow Arabs to get that close so as to endanger his life? How does he allow Arabs to reach him and injure him and not shoot? How, when he feels that his life is in imminent danger, does he un-cock his gun because his friend is "coming to help him?"

The answer is that Rafi Levi was afraid to shoot an Arab because he feared that he would be arrested, tried and jailed. Madness? Worse, it brings to mind the incident at the Cave of the Machpela in Hebron in which an Arab woman suddenly attacked a soldier from behind. Holding a knife she proceeded to attempt to cut his throat. Another soldier, standing nearby fired two shots. The first was in the air. Why does a soldier seeing another soldier in the process of having his throat cut, first shoot in the air? Those are the orders.

The madness and impotency of the authorities have led to a breakdown and an understandable one, in confidence in the government on the part of more and more Jews. And more and more of them have decided to ignore the insanity and use force against Arabs in order to save their own lives and, in the end, save the Jewish state. And, of course, the reaction of the authorities to that has been to punish the Jews.

On August 11, 1988, Pinchas Wallerstein, chairman of the Binyamin Regional Council, was charged with manslaughter. Wallerstein was driving near the Samaritan Arab village of Beitin when his car was stopped by a burning tire, a method used to force Jews to halt and then be pelted with stones. Wallerstein leaped out of his car and, with gun drawn, chased two youths. He shot them both and killed one. The authorities decided to place him on trial.

On September 30, 1988, Rabbi Moshe Levinger, one of the leaders of Gush Emunim and the man who spearheaded the original settlement drive in Kiryat Arba, was driving with his family in the Avraham Avinu compound in Hebron, where he lives. Suddenly a rock came crashing through the window, narrowly missing a grandchild. At an army roadblock in Faisal Street, Levinger asked the soldiers to summon a patrol. They stood waiting when suddenly stones began to fly. Levinger dashed into the Arab marketplace, firing, and shooting an Arab who later died.

On April 2, 1989 Rabbi Levinger was indicted and ordered to stand trial for the death of the Arab.

On April 11, 1989, following the deadly attack on Jews at the Western Wall by thousands of rock-throwing Arabs, four Arabs were shot outside the Old City of Jerusalem's Jaffa Gate. One was killed.

On May 3, 1989, Jews from Kiryat Arba and Hebron, after years of Arab attacks on their buses, vehicles and bodies, met and decided that from now on they would shoot any Arab who threw stones at them. They declared that stones being deadly weapons, they were justified in shooting. In response, in an interview on Israel radio, that day, General Arnan Mitzna, said: Anything that is forbidden, illegal or disturbs the security forces in their activities we will have to deal with. The heads of the settlements know very well what is allowed and what is not."

On May 4, angry Jews from Kiryat Arba in reaction to another attack by Arabs, poured into the streets of Hebron smashing Arab cars and houses. The newspaper Yediot Acharonot (May 5) describes more Jewish reaction and the resultant government one:

"The police plan to deal more strictly with Jewish settlers in Judea and Samaria who take the law into their own hands and commit acts of vengeance against the Arabs.

"Against this background it was decided to ask for a continuance of the remand of three Jews suspected of throwing stones last Wednesday on Arab houses in Kfar Mashah...

"The three reached Kfar Mashah in the wake of an incident in which an Arab resident of the village attempted to murder Levi Meshumar, a (Jewish) resident of Eytz Efraim in Samaria...

(Meanwhile) tens of furious residents of Gush Katif (Gaza) blocked the highway leading to northern Gaza and threw rocks at local residents. This, after Arabs attacked a vehicle with stones, drove off its passengers, and set it on fire."

On May 30, a group of religious Jews went up to pray at what is traditionally believed to be the graves of the Biblical figures, Joshua, his father Nun and Caleb. The graves are located in the Arab village of Kifi Harith and the Jews who had come to pray were attacked by rock-throwing Arabs. The Jews fired at the attackers and one of them, a girl, was shot and killed.

That day, the rabbi of the Yeshiva Od Yosef Chai, in Shchem was attacked as he and 30 other Jews were on a hike in the area. At the village of Sanjil, the rabbi was struck in the head by a rock.

It was not the attack on the rabbi nor all the countless attacks on Jews that now caused rage and anger on the part of the Jewish Left. It was not the fact that that day, it was reported that

some 12,000(!) cases of Arab violations of the law had been already processed by the courts in the 18 months of the intifada.

In response to the shooting of the girl, by Jews acting in self-defense and in an effort to teach the Arabs that they would not drive Jews out of the land, the newspaper Hadashot (May 31, 1989) in a news item wrote:

"The actions of the settlers aroused severe reaction against Israel in world public opinion. The spokesman for the State Department, Richard Butcher, condemned the illegal violent acts of (Jewish) citizens in the territories"

And in an editorial, the paper said: "Madness. There is no other word that better describes the voyage of vengeance in the Arab village Kifl Harith..."

Police arrested eight Jews, and the head of the Civil Administration in Judea-Samaria, Major General Sheika Erez, went to the Arab village to "calm the atmosphere." He promised them that the army would prevent any violation of law and attacks on a "peaceful population." (Hadashot, May 31, 1989)

On June 13, 1989, it was announced that the police had searched 34 houses of settlers in the settlements of Yitzhar, Tel Haim and Ma'ale Lvona in a search for weapons of those suspected of being at Kifl Harith. They also arrested and asked for a remand of two yeshiva students from the Shchem Yeshiva who admitted on radio that they had had been at the village and were attacked by Arabs.

On May 31, 1989, two days before Jerusalem Day, commemorating the liberation of the Old City in 1967, the Jerusalem Police announced that no rallies could be held in the Old City, no groups larger than 50 people would be allowed to enter, and no Israeli flags could be flown. This insanity was immediately challenged by Kach which announced that it would demonstrate in the Old City on the holiday.

That same day, (May 31) the chief-of-staff Dan Shomron issued a warning to Jewish settlers: "There is a small group of settlers that takes the law into its own hands and needlessly attacks Arab residents of the territories. This kind of activity will boomerang against the settlers."

Meanwhile proof that the frustration of the Jews had reached a new peak was seen in a leaflet signed by a group called Dov. Aimed at the troops, it said:

"You must not be cogs in a leftist treacherous steamroller which exists in the IDF. You must refuse any order that degrades you as soldiers and the IDF and the Jewish army."

The Israeli cauldron was heating up dramatically as the natural law of state and citizens went into effect: A government cannot play with the safety and lives of citizens and expect them to forever sit quietly.

And then, came the funeral of Frederick Rosenfeld of Arid. Here is the way The Jerusalem Post described it (June 21, 1989):

"BARKAN, Samaria-Hundreds of West Bank settlers who yesterday surrounded the open grave of their slain neighbor, Frederick Rosenfeld, booed Prime Minister Shamir and called him a traitor Scores then drove to the Morasha junction near Petach Tikva and blocked traffic at that major intersection..."

'You promised to eradicate the intifada.' one settler shouted. Another held up a picture of Rami Chaba, who was killed near Lilon Moreh before the intifada. 'You should look at him. At him,' the demonstrator shouted at Shamir. Another man, who

was filling Rosenfeld~ grave, suddenly stood up and offered Shamir the shovel, reportedly suggesting that the Prime Minister fill the grave himself so that 'maybe you'll have a little compassion.'

"Ariel local council chairman Ron Nahman asked the demonstrators to show due respect for the dead, but he, too, was booed..."

"Shamir said last night that the demonstration at the funeral was a 'difficult experience' for him, Speaking to a group of Likud activists in his Jerusalem office, Shamir accused Meir Kahanes Kach movement of organizing the disturbances.

"'Several people behaved disgracefully, but I am immune to such things,' he remarks. 'It is regrettable that the Jewish people suffers from the malady of internal dissention and senseless hatred,' He claimed that the event only served the Arab cause."

'The Prime Minister's bodyguards, police officers and a police unit specially trained to handle riots circled him during the ceremony and later pushed the crowd aside as they led him to his car. They were surrounded by angry demonstrators who shouted in unison 'Traitor! Traitor!'

"After the funeral, some 80 settlers and supporters set out for the Morasha junction near Petach Tikva. The windshields of at east two cars were smashed along their route, One driver was cut in the forehead, chest and hands. Another, Yaakub Ashur of Bidya. told The Jerusalem Post that a stone was flung at his car from a passing car 'We were nearly killed,' he said. The stone hit one of the passengers in the stomach.

The rioters blocked the entire Morasha junction, sat on the road, chanted 'Death to the Arabs,' and stoned a third car injuring two more passengers.

"Police pushed the rioters off the road. When the police tried to arrest one rioter, other settlers grabbed the man out of their hands."

In the above can be seen all the elements of the consequences of the failure of the Israeli authorities. Their incompetence or their deliberate refusal to take the steps necessary to protect Jewish lives, leads to justified attacks on the government, to angry Jewish action in spite of the government and to the terrible possibility of a revolution, the blame for which will be solely that of the government.

On June 29, 1989, the police asked for the further remand of two Jews accused of killing an Arab after they were attacked by stones at the village of Karwat Beni Zayad. The two, Meir Berg and Uriel Bigun, would be charged with the killing, said the police.

And then came the murder of 16 Jews on the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem bus. Jewish anger and fear now burst its bounds.

Shimon Peres, as he attempted to participate in the funeral of one of the victims, Miriam Zarafi, was booed and cursed as he arrived. Police were forced to encircle him to protect him from angry mourners who tried to attack him.

"Prime Minister Shamir last night deplored attacks by Jews on Arabs. He intends to raise the issue at today's cabinet meeting. Describing the attacks as a 'worrying phenomenon,' Shamir said he was 'absolutely opposed' to such lawlessness. Referring to the attack on Vice Premier Peres at a funeral service for one of the bus victims, Shamir said that it indicated a disturbing 'loss of nerve and will'"

Shamir proved that the Jewish authorities in Israel had learned nothing. His words, more than being foolish, betrayed an insensitivity to those people whom he was pledged to defend. And if he believed that the Jewish masses for whom he had deep contempt would forever remain apathetic and indifferent to their fate, he was even more foolish than his words.

Violence in Jerusalem now continued for the third day albeit at a lower level than at the weekend. Police arrested 11 people in one demonstration in the capital, near the Sanhedria funeral home. There were now 24 people under arrest in connection with the disturbances in the city. Later at the same spot, police used tear gas to disperse Jewish stone-throwers.

The Patt-Gilo crossroads in Jerusalem at the highway over which drove hundred of Arab vehicles daily, now became a regular center for stone-throwing Jews, seeking revenge. As one example, on June 20, 1989, three Arab cars were hit, with three Arabs injured.

In reaction to the Jewish violence against Arabs, the government, meeting on July 9, deplored "irresponsible acts committed by Jews filled with bitterness." Shamir, appearing on Arabic Television said that attacks on Arabs "introduce anarchy in our lives and sap our strength." He called the attacks "negative and very dangerous."

Peres, on a visit to the Arab towns of Tayba and Kalansawa (July 19, 1989) where he was not attacked but warmly welcomed, said: "I am ashamed every time that someone tries to attack a man because he is an Arab. All people are worthy of living in peace and security." The fact that no one was attacking Arabs because they were Arabs but because they represented an enemy that wished to wipe out Israel, was not mentioned. The fact that it was the Arabs who did not wish to allow Jews to live "in peace and security" was also left unsaid by Peres on his visit to the Arabs.

In general the reaction of the Jewish authorities to Jewish bitterness and frustration is instructive.

Police Minister Bar Lev declared (July 9): "Israel cannot allow anarchy to run riot in the streets since this destroys the foundation of democracy. I have instructed the police of Israel to fully enforce punishment of lawbreakers in order that we may continue to lead orderly lives."

Bar Lev had previously called the rioters primitivism (primitive and backward.) The word, which had become over the years a code word for Sephardic Jews, was not lost on people who had been victims of an Israeli democracy that ripped from them their heritage and taught them the kinds of crimes and social behavior they had never known when living in the Exile.

The authorities in Israel were frightened. Frightened not so much for the sacred concepts of law and order and democracy that they so cynically have crushed in the past, but for their own power.

David Levy one of the godfathers of the Likud, said (July 10, 1989):

"It is our moral and civic duty to condemn such acts of revenge, Regardless of anyone's feelings, this cannot be permitted. Nothing will be accomplished by such actions, He said that only authorized organs of the state have the right to use force, and that law and order must be preserved."

Dan Meridor, Likud Minister of Justice whose father was a leading member of the "fighting family" the underground Irgun, said the same day that the attacks on the Arabs are "inhuman, Un-Jewish, and criminal."

Israel would continue to fight terrorism using proper legal means, he said. We will win, because we have no alternative. But the fight did not give anyone license to take the law into his own

hands he stressed. "We will not do to others what was done to us.

The true test of Israel's strength, Meridor declared, is "whether we can uphold the values which we demand of others."

And President Herzog, speaking at the President's mansion at a swearing-in ceremony for nine judges, said that "as a nation which for generations has suffered the discriminations of injustice, culminating in the Holocaust, we are forbidden to follow the lead of those who would make laws unto themselves, heaping dust on those selfsame human rights which have been the guiding light of our people throughout the generations."

What was bizarre about all this bringing down of "Jewish values" was the fact that each and every one of the Israeli leaders who did so, was a man who rejected the Divine nature of Judaism and who either through ignorance or deliberate design, corrupted those authentic Jewish values. There was nothing in Judaism that demanded that Jews not act in every way against an enemy-a national enemy-that wished to wipe out the Jews and their state.

The Talmudic dictum "if one comes to slay you, slay him first," was clear and meant that one had to do everything necessary to insure a Jewish life. The Torah and Talmud are replete with teach-ings that go against the Hellenism and foreign western values that people like Meridor and Herzog so value.

And the equating of innocent Jews massacred over the ages with an Arab enemy that wished to wipe out Israel was an abomination.

And above all, pious words of cynical humanism while Jews remained the target of Arab hatred and attacks had no effect.

On July 20, police arrested Rabbi Moshe Peretz of Kiryat Arba for allegedly damaging Arab property in the notorious town of Halhul, near Hebron. Ten settlers, including Rabbi Peretz were on their way to the grave of the Prophet Nathan, when they were attacked from all directions. Rabbi Peretz fired at them. He was arrested.

On July 30, Arabs were attacked in Rishon Letzion and Jerusalem while that same evening a car in which David Shtibi, a Jewish settler in the Gaza Strip was driving, was attacked by Arabs near Beit Hanun. Shtibi was in the car with two nephews who suffered from a deep trauma due to being stoned other times. Shtibi got out of the car and fired at the Arabs, killing one of them. He was arrested. The head of the regional Council, Tzvi Handel, told the newspaper Ha'Aretz (August 1, 1989):

"The arrest of Shtibi is brazenness of the highest order. It is not possible that he should be attacked by a barrage of stones, his life and the life of children endangered, and he should not fire back"

But the authorities in Israel, blind and obtuse, continued their stubborn efforts to drive Jews to revolution. In August 1989, in a truly outrageous decision, Supreme Court Justice Gabriel Bach, ruled on an appeal, from Yaron Ben Yona, 33, of Jerusalem. On July 7, after the murder of the Jews on the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem bus, in anger and bitterness Ben Yona stoned an Arab truck in the Shmuel Hanavi section of Jerusalem. He was ordered held without bail. He then appealed to the High Court. That court had previously ruled that in order to hold a suspect without bail until his trial, it was necessary to show that he was a danger to the public peace. Now Bach brutally swept that away broadened the police powers of a state that already had far too many, and approved the lower court decision. He declared: "Whoever deliberately throws firebombs or stones at vehicles and endangers traffic-whatever his motives and national identity may be-must know that the chances of his being freed on bail are doubtful."

What Bach was saying was that there was no difference between an Arab who throws stones at Jewish cars as part of his struggle to put an end to Israel and a Jew who does the same act in retaliation.

This is what represents authority in Israel. Is it any wonder that people are driven to the brink? They are partners to the murder of Jews.

Chapter 7: The Destroyers from Withing

Within There is yet another factor that drives more and more of the people of Israel to frustration, anger and fear for their future. That is the danger of the Destroyers from Within.

The ultimate hope of the Arabs who dream of destroying the Jewish State, of realizing that vision, is the left-liberal camp inside Israel. And it is precisely they who raise high the warning of "civil war" and breakdown of law, order and democracy. The cold truth is, however, that it is they who, for a myriad of psychological reasons, seek-indeed, need-a civil war. It is those who speak of the rule of law, who will never accept that law and who, indeed, at this very moment, break the law openly even as they cloak themselves in the garment of morality' and "humanism". It is they who give inestimable aid to the enemies of Israel in their drive to murder and destroy Jews and their State.

As the first anniversary of the intifada fell, a large demonstration by these people was held in Tel Aviv to support the "Palestinians" and to condemn Israeli policies against them. One of those who spoke at the conclave of Destroyers from Within was Dan Almagor, an Israeli entertainer and song writer, who rose to compare Israel to Nazi Germany as he raised up the memory of Eichmann, saying:

"It is time for us to begin to prepare for ourselves the glass cages in which we will sit when they put us on trial for what we have done to the Palestinian people."

It is difficult to analyze these truly, truly sick words from a truly, truly sick mind. But sickness is no contradiction to danger, and Almagor is a very dangerous person, all the more so because there are so many like him. There are many thousands of Israeli Jews who agree with him and who approve of the poem he read to the crowd and that said:

***You, the soldiers of every corps, every unit,
Look your commanders straight in the eye
and say "No."***

We wont shoot at children!

We wont shoot at children!

These children want to live, with dignity,

As a free people in their own land.

What will they say then,

The colonels, the battalion heads,the lance corporals.

About the terrible beatings, the brutal treatment,

The destruction of homes,

And above all the humiliation, the humiliation...

More than a stabbing of Israel and its army in the back; more than a backing of the enemies of the Jewish people who will bring upon them yet another national horror, but an open call to violation of the law by a man who, regularly, warns of the "right wing" seeking a civil war And this is a violation of the law that is not based upon the reality of Jews being killed and injured through the policy of a government whose obligation is to prevent that-but a call for subversion based upon a personal sense of "morality" that in the end proves to be the worst of immorality.

And he is only one of a large and growing number of the liberal-leftist axis who, while preparing for an attack on law and order, lay the groundwork for it by non-stop indictments of "the right wing" for supposedly plotting to do just that.

The danger to the survival of Israel comes from the left-liberal axis which commits treason every day by supporting the deadly enemy of Israel and by destroying the morale of the Jew-especially the young Jew-in the country.

It is no coincidence that among the subversives and supporters of "Palestine", are large groups of what are called "intellectuals." In this grab-bag appear actors, singers, writers-a mixed bag, indeed-of frustrated and disturbed people who, as in every western country find a "cause" that will give them reason for their bored empty jaded lives of loud desperation. And so, singer Hava Alberstein announced in 1983 that she would be on hand in Haifa to greet a PLO-chartered boat carrying leaders of the intifada who were expelled by the government. Incredibly she was chosen to be one of those to light a torch at the Western Wall to launch Independence Day, in 1989. She is hardly alone in the gang of "entertainers" who get their "jollies" by supporting the "oppressed Palestinians." Some of the country's most popular singers, such as Shlomo Artzi, Shalom Hanoch, Nurit Galron, Astar Shamir, and Si Hi-man, have appeared at various rallies to protest Israeli policy in the "occupied territories."

Indeed, there is a Committee of Israeli and Palestinian Artists and Academics. One of its members, novelist Yoram Kanink, is troubled by the plight of the Arabs jailed in the Ketziot prison in the Negev, where they were sent because of their attacks against the Israeli "occupation". "I can't sleep at night because of it," he says, adding that he never could have believed that a "moral society like Israel" could be indifferent to the plight of the "Palestinians".

The problem is that these people hold sway over the most powerful of weapons: the news media and entertainment industry. They reach huge numbers of people and influence them. Whether we speak of the spate of self-hating movies that condemn the army that glorify the poor oppressed Arab, that raise high the banner of intermarriage between Jew and Arab, or the state TV and radio which are totally in the hands of the left-the average Israeli is like clay in the hands of the potter.

And so on June 12, 1988, the Israel Broadcasting Authority decided to take disc jockey Shamira Imber's live show off the air after she played a song critical of the army and urged all Israelis to listen to it. An authority spokeswoman said Shamira Imber's weekly "Good Things" was cancelled because she had played the controversial Hebrew song "Shooting and Crying" and had commented that "every home in Israel" should listen to it.

The song protests the army's killings in the territories during the uprising. Imber had played it on Kol Israel radio on the eve of Holocaust Memorial Day. Several listeners, among them Holocaust survivors, complained about the remarks, the spokeswoman said. (Jerusalem Post, June 12, 1988)

But, of course, it is more than artists and intellectuals. It is activists from the kibbutzim and the secular urban middle and upper class groups. They tunnel under the state and the army and the foundations are already battered and very weakened.

Leftist groups, often accompanied by Knesset Members, visit Arab villages in the territories to voice their support and condolences for action taken against them by the army. Thus, on December 18, 1988, some 50 members of Peace Now and Israelis By Choice visited the village of Beit Sahour near Bethlehem, a place that is notorious for its attacks on Jewish vehicles. No matter Accompanied by leftist Knesset Member Ron Cohen, they came in "friendship". The newspaper Hadashot (December 19, 1988) described a fascinating part of the visit: "Before the speeches hundreds of Arabs stood on their feet and burst into singing of "Biladi, Biladi" (the anthem of the PLO), a thing that caused some discomfort to the guests sitting on the dais."

The item in Hadashot about the visit of the leftists to the Arab village appeared next to one that described an attack on a car in which a 20-month old Jewish baby, Yona Asaf, was struck in the head and eye.

As the present Arab rebellion broke out, bringing fear and trepidation for their lives and those of their loved ones to hundreds of thousands of Jews, many of them went into the streets to both protest the impotency and bankruptcy of the government which betrayed its obligation to protect Jewish lives as well as to deal with the Arab threat themselves. It was a question of Jews racing a danger to their very existence and determining that they would not allow their lives and those of their loved ones to be endangered.

Despite that, the liberal-left axis went on an orgy of defamation and hate against Jews who "broke the law and violated democratic foundations".

After the incident at Kifi Harith and after months of deadly attacks by Arabs on Jews, after months and more of almost superhuman patience and restraint, when finally Jews had erupted in acts of self-defense-the newspaper Yediot Aharonot (May 31, 1989) carried an hysterical article by Roni Shaked headed, "The Framework of Law is Shattered." Suddenly after more than a year of lack of law and order as Jews were attacked, the leftists had discovered "the framework of law".

And after the bus obscenity in which 16 Jews were murdered and Jewish frustration boiled over into totally understandable acts of violence against people who dream of destroying them, the Destroyers from Within achieved a crescendo of hate and defamation. Thus, The Jerusalem Post (July 9, 1989):

"Jews, the victims of racist prejudice throughout the ages, are now committing the worst kind of racism themselves and are meting out collective punishment. The specter of hatred is raging throughout the land, while passive bystanders allow the outrages to take place. In the case of yesterday's attack against an Arab bather on the beach at Caesarea even policemen refused to intervene.

"Meir Kahane, the notorious leader of the Kach movement, is allowed to call for the mass expulsion of Arabs in the heart of Jerusalem and Jewish extremists attack political leaders who do not share their radical views.

"Prime Minister Shamir is to be commended for his forceful condemnation yesterday of these recent attacks which he loathes. His voice of censure must be joined by every person who truly cares about Israel's future."

And an editorial in Hadashot the same day: "The police, the Shin Bet, the IDF and the courts will deal with the terrorists according to law (sic)." And: "There is nothing that will cause the terrorists greater joy than having democratic Israel in which the law rules, turn into a second Lebanon run by an armed mob that obeys the law of the jungle."

And Ha'Aretz in an editorial that day titled, "Have We Become as Sodom?" wrote: "If we do not dam the way before the men of passion, we will lose all that is left of what we call Jewish ethics..."

Meir Amor, a lieutenant in the army refuses to serve in the occupied territories. His friends and colleagues from the Sociology Department at Tel Aviv University come to the Ministry of Defense to protest on his behalf. In a large and immensely friendly article in the newspaper Al Hamishmar (the paper of the Marxist Mapam Party), Dr. Moshe Weitman of the Department says: "This is a reaction of disgust against the policy of hitting, and a feeling of abomination against the attitude toward our neighbors (sic). We applaud him..."

On February 15, 1988, Yesh Gvul-a notorious inciter against serving in the "occupied territories", announced that they knew of 260 soldiers who had announced that they would not serve. (The truth is that the army quietly allows most objectors to serve inside the "Green Line".)

In an article in the May 1988 issue of the far-left magazine New Outlook, Peretz Kidron, a free-lance journalist, wrote about Yesh Gvul, saying in part:

"For its part, Yesh Gvul is preparing to meet the challenge by stepping up its own protest campaign. When the authorities tried to starve Gaza refugee camps into submission with extended curfews, 300 members and sympathizers joined a vigil at the approaches to the area in sympathy with Ofer Kassif, who was serving his sentence for refusing duty there." Yesh Gvul volunteers have been issuing soldiers with a replica of the standard army paybook-"a little blue book"-with advice on their legal right-and duty-to refuse participation in unlawful actions. A new booklet is being prepared with "survival-kit" advice to prospective refuseniks.

"Just as it did with regard to Lebanon a few years back, Yesh Gvul points to the occupied territories with the cry: 'There is a limit!'"

The article was titled "Limit to Obedience"...

Well before this current Arab rebellion broke out, Yesh Gvul was busy breaking the law. Thus, on December 26, 1986, members of the group handed out flyers to soldiers in Bethlehem, Ramalla, Hebron and Jericho, "warning" them against the "destructive consequences and influence of the occupation on the Palestinian population, on IDF soldiers and on Israeli society."

Yesh Gvul regularly stands outside Prison Six, near Atlit, where soldiers who refuse to serve are jailed, and supports their breaking of the law.

The infiltration of leftists who openly call for violation of the law because of their own moral views, into schools and other places where youth can be found, saw a convicted traitor, Udi Adiv, invited to speak at the Experimental School in Jerusalem in January 1989. Adiv was arrested in 1972 and sentenced to 17 years in jail (part of it was later suspended) for having joined a Syrian anti-Israel terror group and spying for Syria against Israel. He was a member of Kibbutz Can Shmuel, and in 1988 his brother was also arrested on charges of belonging to an Arab terror group.

On March 7, 1989, Professor Yeshayahu Leibowitz called for "a mass movement of refusal to serve in the territories". Speaking at a Tel Aviv meeting of Ad Kan (Till Here), a group of academics who oppose what they call the "occupation", he said that such a movement would "place the regime before an impossible situation, because it could never court-martial hundreds of objectors for fear of destabilizing the IDF".

Leibowitz, who had coined the obscene term "Judeo-Nazis" and thus spit in the grave of the six million, was, of course, not arrested for incitement, subversion, etc. nor condemned by any editorials.

The youth are the main targets of the Destroyers from Within. On July 2, 1989, dozens of twelfth-graders from the wealthy secular schools of north Tel Aviv appeared at the Ministry of Defense carrying plastic balls and demanding that the army use those and not plastic bullets against the Arabs. They also condemned army service in the "occupied territories". The kibbutzim, leftist centers of un-Jewishness and moral confusion have long been centers, too, of debate over service in the "occupied territories".

The kibbutzim, having long eaten the sour grapes of anti-religion, anti-nationalism and Hellenism, should not be surprised when their children's teeth are set on edge. And so, at about

3 a.m. on a February 1989 night, a resident of the Aleph neighborhood in Beersheba, noticed a group of youths painting a wall in black and red. On the wall they painted various slogans including, "I am an army objector, and you?" "Long Live Free Palestine", and "Rabin to the Popular Committees for Trial". They also painted a black swastika.

When the residents called to them to stop, they fled in a car whose license number a resident noted and turned over to the police.

A quick check confirmed that the car belonged to Kibbutz Kramim, a kibbutz belonging to the far-left Hashomer Hatzair Group. The police arrived and arrested five young members of the kibbutz, soldiers serving the Nahal unit of the IDE. The fruits of the noxious seeds.

The newspaper Maariv, (January 8 1989) carried the following news item:

"A call for civil disobedience has been circulated recently in kibbutzim and leftist circles. The call is aimed at those who oppose Israeli policy in the territories and asks them to take every symbolic protest step, non-violently...

"David Palma, of Kibbutz Kfar Hanasi, was recently freed from prison for refusal to serve in the territories. Palma... published an article in the magazine, In the Kibbutz, in which he calls for civil disobedience. Among the rest he writes: 'Let us cease to cooperate with the authority. In other words: I call for non-violent civil disobedience'.

" As the Arab sense of power, pride, victory and, above all-justice of his cause-grows and flourishes, so does there arise, like some noxious weed, a growing number of Israeli Jews stricken with a sickness of soul that can only be termed a kind of spiritual and psychological AIDS. Deeply troubled people, ridden with guilt, that time-dishonored Jewish disease, they were conceived in the psychoses of an exile of centuries, and born in the self-hate that afflicts so many Jews, including those in Israel. Jews in Israel-the normal and JEWISH Jews-see this, see the destruction of their state and the Holocaust of axes and knives brought closer to them and their loved ones. Would we be surprised if they react in fury? Jews-the normal and JEWISH Jews-see the Left-liberal axis aiding the Arabs in their drive to wipe out Israel. Should we be surprised if they demand that the state be saved from them?

Jews in Israel-the normal and JEWISH Jews-see the Destroyers From Within justify the breakdown of law, order and the democratic process, because of their own personal, subjective outlook (an outlook that all normal Jews see as sick, perverted and twisted). Can it come as a surprise to anyone if they the normal Jews, learn from that and then declare that the right of defiance of the authority is even more legitimate in their case in opposing authorities whose major reason for existence is to protect them and is either unwilling or unable to?

But there is more. The Destroyers from Within-because of a deep pathological need-move to civil war between Jew and Jew.

The ceaseless efforts on the part of the liberal-left Destroyers from Within to convince people that there is a right-wing conspiracy to create civil war, and that THIS is the reason that the "humanists" must strike first, constitute a sham and a deliberate lie. It is worse-it is a blood libel every bit as obscene as anything the gentiles ever concocted.

An ideological struggle between Jews who are Jewish and who have an absolute belief in Jewish values and nation and land and Torah against those whose Hellenized and gentilized life has left them with all the doubts that the JEWISH Jews and Arabs do not have. It is this terrible doubt and, even worse, terrible guilt and the ultimate self-hate that must emerge from them, that lead to the awful need to commit national suicide, to a civil war that will lead to a perverse parody of Samson: Let my soul die with the Jewish Jews".

The June 12, 1987 issue of the New York-based Hebrew-language paper Yisrael Shelanu, carried a front-page story which read:

"At the meeting that was held in the beginning of the week in the office of Foreign Minister Shimon Peres, Cabinet Minister Ezer Weizman suggested 'to prepare the groundwork for activating the 'holy cannon' against the settlers by way of having the Ministry of Defense clarify to the public that they (the settlers) attack soldiers of the IDF."

According to the paper, the meeting was held with Peres, Defense Minister Rabin and senior officers of the Ministry of Defense.

When one remembers that "the holy cannon" was what Labor Prime Minister Ben Gurion blessed for having shelled the Irgun ship Altalena in 1948 and which led to the murder of 16 Jews, one appreciates the sheer revulsion of the idea. But it was seriously put out, and by a cabinet minister of the Left.

On July 31, 1987, again before the intifada-the weekly Tel Aviv paper, Ha'ir carried an interview with Alexander (Olek) Natzar, a leftist member of the Marxist Hashomer Hatzair movement and member of Kibbutz Mizra. The article says, in part:

"Natzar claims that the disagreement between the Right and Left in Israel is not a political argument in which one side can persuade the other in the accepted manner. 'A 16-year-old who joins Kahane is not a political thinker. We are dealing here with fanaticism and to my great regret a person with a fanatic mentality understands only strength...'"

The fraud and the corruption of truth that lie in Naizar's words are typical of the Left. They are liars and they create blood libels in order to justify their inability to debate ideologically. They create a '16-year-old Golem" but never reply to the question: What of the 60-year-old who joins Kahane? Are you prepared to debate him? And what of Kahane? Are you prepared to debate him? Of course not, because they cannot, and they choose to kill the Jews whose ideology is so clear that it shows off the nakedness of the bankrupt, secular left.

Natzar calls for the creation of a 300-man force that will simply defy the government in a civil disobedience campaign. "Soon," writes the paper, "they will begin to disregard orders from the army. We are going out in civil disobedience. Civil disobedience is a painful thing that people are not used to, but we see the government as a foreign government. Of course it is a tragedy not to go to the army and until a few years ago I did not think that it would come to that". Of course not, because until then, the fascists of the Left were convinced that no one could take power from them.

In March, 1988, the Assistant Minister for Agriculture, Knesset Member Avraham Katz-Oz, in a forum of the "Bloc of Doves" of the Kibbutz Hamuchedet, in Kibbutz Mayan Tzvi, warned of "threats from the Herut Movement and its people that retreat from the territories will lead to civil war and it behooves the kibbutz movement to prepare for this and have ready a proper reaction to the threats of the "Right."

Now, there were no "threats of the Right" and the call by Katz-Oz was one more effort to create a blood libel and prepare the ground for a leftist sponsored civil war.

On February 26, 1988, leftist Haim Baram, son of the former Labor Party boss of Jerusalem and brother of the former Secretary-General of the Labor Party Knesset Member Uzi Baram, made it clear that he was prepared for a civil war, not because of any "threat" from the Right, but on ideological grounds.

In discussing the possibility of a governmental decision to transfer the Arabs out of the country Baram wrote, (Kol Ha'ir February 26, 1988): "I will personally fight, and with arms too, against

people who will take steps here against an entire population, steps that will remind me (and the world) of the Nazi crimes. I am certain that hundreds of thousands will do the same and not only real leftists..."

Baram made the same point in a column in the Jerusalem Post (Aug. 4, 1988), writing: "The only way to stop the racists, to prevent a landslide victory for the carriers of the transfer plague, is to treat them firmly and drive them back into the fringes of illegitimacy Ze'evi and his likes must hear, not only from identified leftists, that any attempt on their part to deport Arabs en masse, will cause a bloody civil war in our country."

On April 15, 1988, in an interview in Davar Prof Zev Sternal, a well-known leftist intellectual and a self-proclaimed "expert on fascism", made the following points:

"Kahane is a Nazi in Jewish variation. Gush Emunim is a Jewish-Israeli variation of fascism... The problem is not Gush Emunim or Kahane or Tehiya. The greatest danger is that the majority of conformists is captured by slogans such as "security" and "unity and is not capable of standing up against the revolutionary fervor of the Right."

The arrogance of Sternhal and his contempt for the "majority" is the true earmark of the fascist, and the professor typifies Left fascism in Israel. He is a professor; he is an intellectual; he understands; he and the left have the right to revolt because the masses must be led. He continues:

"One cannot stop fascism with rational reasons or discussions." Again, the fear of the Left of its inability to rationally debate a Kahane or the Right. And so, the Golem and blood libel of "fascists" with whom there is no possibility of discussion. And he continues:

"(Fascism) is only stopped by force and only when, against the pressure and violence of the fascists we are prepared to place counter pressure and violence, and willingness to endanger ourselves through civil war Only one who is prepared to go with tanks against Ofra (a Jewish settlement in Samaria) will be able to block the fascist tide that threatens to drown Israeli democracy."

And: "In my opinion there are worse disasters than civil war such as the destruction of democratic culture. A society can come out better for a civil war."

The real face of fascism. The real face of the Jewish haters of Jews. The real face of the terrified Hellenists, gentilized Jews terrified of debate and intellectual confrontation, liars, frauds and murderers. They are prepared to use tanks against Jews, all the while preparing the way by waving high the bloody libel of "rightwing fascism that seeks civil war."

And Amos Oz, resident High Priest of Israeli fiction writes in Yediot Aharonot (June 8, 1989): "If the State of Israel will not rise now and stop the cult of Messianism (sic!), so closed and cruel, that threatens to destroy all that is dear and holy to us-the day will not be far off when they will stop us. Shchem and Hebron are only way stations in the path of Levinger and Kahane to cast the wild concepts over Tel Aviv and Jerusalem and Dimona."

Again. The State of Israel must "stop" the "cult". Let us not even dignify the man with a discussion of what makes this a cult more than the Marxism and the democracy to which members of the Kibbutzim and the Left bow daily? And why must Israel stop it? Is the "cult" not using the democratic methods that Oz so cynically and confusedly waves on high? Of course, but the terrified Oz cannot debate. He must defame and he must call for civil war, "Stop the cult..."

Yisrael Eilat, writing in Davar (June 20, 1989): "We must make it clear in words that are not capable of being misunderstood, that the threat of civil war does not deter us. A civil war is preferable to a racist regime."

It is imperative that we understand and summarize clearly what the position of the left-liberal fascists, is, what the Destroyers from Within are really saying and really mean:

- 1) They are not concerned with any "civil war" threat from the right. That is a canard, a deliberate fraud, a blood libel, a Golem-created so as to clear the way for their own civil war since they know that they will not have the majority in Israel.
- 2) They are not prepared to accept any democratically elected government whose policies THEY consider to be "racist", "nazi", "fascist". And it is THEY who define all the above and it is THEY who label and libel and set the ground rules.
- 3) They set up their own moral and ethical views and they claim the right to break the law and go to civil war when those views are violated.
- 4) The claim on the part of the Left-liberal axis of the right to break the law and disobey the government is based on their own personal, subjective views. THEY claim to have the right to place their own personal, finite, views over that of the majority. This arrogant claim differs totally from the rights of the people to rise up against a government that violates the most basic obligation to its own people-the obligation to protect the lives and property of those citizens. That is universally accepted as a basic right of the people over and against any government.
- 5) The Left-liberal axis which seeks a civil war is a danger not only to Jewishness and the Jewish state but to the very democracy they so cynically and fraudulently parrot.

I repeat what I said earlier: The most fundamental obligation of government-the source of its legitimacy and right to rule over the people-is its responsibility to guarantee the lives and safety of its citizens. If it either cannot or will not fulfill that obligation, it faces the loss of its moral and legal right of authority.

Chapter 8: The Legitimacy of Government and Revolution

An ocean of people-millions-and rivers of money-millions-poured into the streets of Paris in July 1989, to celebrate a revolution. It was the 200th anniversary of the rising up of the French people against a government that had been accepted originally as legitimate, legal and, indeed, divine. It was the 200th anniversary of the storming of the Bastille and the freeing of the prisoners of the regime. It was the 200th anniversary of the taking of the law into the hands of the people, and Frenchmen joined by people from all over the world, cheered and reveled in the memory hailing it as a landmark in history with fireworks, parades, operas, marching bands and singing and dancing in the streets through the wee hours of the morning.

"Vive la Revolution!" Hail the Revolution! Hail the right of the people to rise up against a government that it feels to be repressive, that refuses to grant liberty equality and fraternity. That was the message that western civilization gave the world in July 1989, as more than 30 heads of state looked on beaming approvingly.

That revolution has become an accepted, indeed, an applauded concept in a world that regularly pays lip service to condemnation of "violence" and homage to "law and order" is a subject for contemplation.

WHY IS REVOLUTION AN ACCEPTED CONCEPT? AND IS IT ALWAYS SO? WHAT ARE ITS LIMITATIONS, IF ANY? AND WHAT ARE THE LEGITIMATE GRIEVANCES THAT MAY GIVE RISE TO IT?

To understand this, we must understand, first, the very nature of the state, of government, of the individual. We must understand the relationship that exists between them. We must

understand the birth of the nation and state, their origins; hence, the nature of their existence and the rights and obligations possessed by government and individual. From this, we can better grasp the right or illegality of revolution, rebellion, civil disobedience and any act of conflict with authority.

The nature of government, by definition, is limitation on the freedom of the individual to live his life as he sees fit. The right of government to be, to take away freedom from a human being in any degree, is based in western, secular, democratic society only on the consent of the individual to give up that absolute freedom he once possessed in return for a thing that is both more urgent and important and that only a government can give—security of life and property.

According to modern western political theory the modern state as we know it came into being through the evolutionary process of families and tribes and clans, eventually forming into a recognizable nation-people which, for reasons of security and survival, recognized an authority settled in a particular place of their own, so that both nation and state were governed by the authority chosen by the people. The state was created by consent of the people who, for practical and pragmatic reasons, recognized the need for an authority which would preserve internal order and carry out the defense of the people against external enemies. The authority-government derived its right to decree without defiance both from the practical need to have orderly process as well as from the grant by the people of power to speak and act in their name.

For secular, western democratic civilization, freedom of the individual is the starting point of society; a thing that is absolute; a thing that is granted by natural law or simply a thing that, by the nature of things, is the basis of human existence. No one, no individual and no group of individuals has the right to arbitrarily set up as authority over the individual and to take away any freedom from him whatsoever. The concept of government in modern western democracy is a concept based on consent, con-sent of the people to be governed.

And that is not a cheap and simple matter. The people does not easily give up its freedom. It does so only in return for something that is supremely important for them, a thing that by its absence threatens all the freedoms that they possess and desire. Security. Without security and safety of life and limb and property little else matters for the individual; and it is this that is the minimal, fundamental basis for governmental authority and intervention in the life of the individual. It is based upon government's assurance to guarantee security and safety that the individual grudgingly surrenders total freedom.

This political axiom is accepted by even the most libertarian of philosophers. Even those who are Spencerian in their thinking and who deny the most basic social and economic role of government, admit and accept fully the fundamental role of government to secure the life and property of the individual from threat from within or from without; and this only because the individual himself so desires and has thus agreed to the limitation on his absolute freedom. It is a quid pro quo; it is the essence of the social contract theory that has become an axiom in democratic society.

And this being so, western democratic society goes on to maintain that if government violates its part of the contract or compact; if, having been given power over the individual on the condition that it safeguard his life and property, it fails to do so; why then the contract has been breached, violated and is no longer in effect. The people who voluntarily gave of their freedom and power to a governmental authority have the basic natural right to cancel the breached contract, to nullify government, to take back their original absolute powers.

This is the general consensus of the secular western thinkers of modern times. This is the origin of state and nation; this is the basis of the relationship between individual and authority; upon this was built the rock of mutual rights and obligations.

Clearly this was not always so. Indeed, all the above mentioned constitutes what is essentially a radical, revolutionary theory born in the relatively recent events of the past 300 years or so. It is the product of a radical break with the ancien regime-and not that of the French court alone. Western civilization, per se (not to mention Oriental and African cultures), saw the individual as not only not free to live life as he saw fit, but as a part of a society in which he served his god and the divine emissary of that god-the monarch. There were no "natural rights" of man. There were no basic and fundamental prerogatives for the ordinary individual. He had a status into which he was born and that status was one that obliged him to bend the knee and bow the head before authority-king or oligarchy-that drew its legitimacy from Heaven.

It was the dawn of modern times, with the profound explosion of the Renaissance; the expansion of the mind of man; the lighting of the darkness of the cornered mysteries of the world through the light of reason, science and technology that led man, the subser-vient and obedient, to dare to be man the questioner, prober and, eventually the breaker of idols. In a sense, it was yet another serpent that now entered the medieval Eden and tempted man with the glorious pleasure of Rebellion.

Long before the French Revolution, the principle of the Social Contract, with its primacy of the individual and his rights, was waved on high. A stormy seventeenth century saw an even stormier England undergo a series of upheavals, each of which buried ever more the Old Authority and raised ever higher the rights of individual man. Bitter conflict between the Stuart king, Charles I, who had dissolved parliament after parliament, and the people, led by Cromwell, resulted in a bloody civil war that led to the overthrow of the monarchy itself and the execution of Charles in 1649.

The insistence of the king on absolute powers that made a mockery of Parliament, had raised the question of the rights and obligations of both state and individual. A basic discussion of the rights of the individual was held as early as 1647 at the General Council of the Parliamentary Army in Putney near London. There, a number of army officers defended an Agreement of the People, a compact that called for basic rights. A classic statement of rights was presented by Major Wildman:

"A principle much spreading and much to my trouble... is this: that when persons once be engaged, though the Engagement appears to be unjust, yet the person must set down and suffer under it; and that therefore, in case a parliament, as a true Parliament, does anything unjustly, if we be engaged to submit to the laws that they shall make, if they make an unjust law, though they make an unrighteous law, yet we must swear obedience.

"I confess to me this principle is very dangerous, and I speak it the rather because I see it spreading abroad in the Army again. Whereas it is contrary to what the Army first declared: that they stood upon such principles of right and freedom, and the laws of nature and nations, whereby men were to preserve themselves though the persons to whom authority belonged should fail in it... and therefore if anything tends to the destruction of a people, because the thing is absolutely unjust and tends to their destruction [they may preserve themselves]."

What was being declared here was that there were certain natural rights of man that could not be abrogated or curtailed by any authority and that while, in general, the individual was bound to obey government, that in no way bound him to sit quietly and passively as his just and basic rights were being trampled.

Though the monarchy was restored in 1660 after the death of the Republican Cromwell, nothing would ever be the same. Charles, himself, had been forced to sign the Petition of Rights which followed the tradition of the ancient Magna Carta in establishing fundamental English liberties,

and the restored Monarchy guaranteed that absolute power was a thing of the past. In the reign of the new king, Charles II, Parliament enacted the Habeas Corpus Act and the swirling dissatisfaction of the country led to far more sweeping and revolutionary events. Indeed, this was the time of what has come to be known as the Glorious Revolution.

This was the uprising against James II, who had attempted to coerce England into surrendering both constitution and religion. Led by William of Orange, the Glorious Revolution toppled the Stuart dynasty and James fled to France in 1688. William of Orange now convened a convention that called for an elected Parliament which in turn met in 1689 to draw up the famous Declaration of Rights.

This document contained a list of the main principles of the constitution which had been violated by James II, with a statement that they were ancient and undoubted rights of the English people. It stigmatized the powers claimed by the late king to dispense with or suspend laws as illegal usurpations. It stated that every subject had a right to petition the king, and should not be molested for so doing. It stipulated for the frequent summoning of Parliaments, and for free speech and debate within the two Houses. The raising and maintenance of a standing army without the permission of Parliament was declared illegal. In a clause recalling the most famous paragraph of Magna Carta, it was stated that all levying of taxes or loans without the consent of the representatives of the nation was illegal. The Declaration was afterwards confirmed and made permanent as the "Bill of Rights."

And there now arose an effort to philosophically and ideologically justify the stormy and revolutionary events of the chaos and uprising, the convulsions and rebellions against authority. And the man who became the philosopher-king of modern western, liberal, democratic man was the philosophical apologist for the Glorious Revolution, John Locke. But he was destined to be more than that. His arguments were to be set in the concrete of historical permanence and used by every revolutionary of his time and beyond. Those who rose up in the Americas against British rule leaned on Locke and those in France who guillotined Louis and Marie-An-toinette borrowed from his arguments.

And let it never be forgotten that the leaders of the State of Israel, who see in it a secular western democratic entity fully subscribe to the postulates of the man named Locke. Indeed, his treatises on government were written so as to provide a philosophical basis and justification for the Glorious Revolution, but they remain the cornerstone of modern, secular western democratic theory.

Locke's first point is that Man is, by nature, free. This "state of nature" is described by Locke as follows:

"To understand political power right, and derive it from its original, we must consider what state all men are naturally in, and that is, a state of perfect freedom to order their actions and dispose of their possessions and persons as they think fit, within the bounds of the law of nature, without asking leave or depending upon the will of any other man."

This being so, not only can no one-no authority-take away freedom from individual man without his consent, but the only legitimacy that government possesses derives from the individual's consent to a limitation on his own freedom. And this he does only in order to assure his safety and security, without which none of his rights would be safe. The threat from within and from without to his life and property, the "state of war" that threatens his "state of nature" leads him to agree to a social contract with government, under which he gives up the absolute freedom that is his natural state in return for protection from the state of war. And that power which he gives government is absolutely limited by the social contract to that which is good for the individual. In Locke's words:

"Men, being, as has been said, by nature all free, equal, and independent, no one can be put out of this estate and subjected to the political power of another without his own consent. The only way whereby anyone divests himself of his natural liberty and puts on the bonds of civil society is by agreeing with other men to join and unite into a community for their comfortable, safe, and peaceable living one among another, in a secure enjoyment of their properties and a greater security against any that are not of it. This any number of men may do, because it injures not the freedom of the rest; they are left as they were in the limberly of the state of nature. When any number of men have so consented to make one community or government, they are thereby presently incorporated and make one body politic wherein the majority have a right to act and conclude the rest."

And concerning governments:

"Their power, in the utmost bounds of it, is limited to the public good of the society. It is a power that has no other end but preservation, and therefore can never have to right to destroy, enslave, or designedly to impoverish the subjects."

The reason for giving up unlimited freedom, hence the sole raison d'etre for government and its legitimacy, is the preservation of property, as Locke says directly: Government has no other end but the preservation of property." And he adds: "The supreme power (government) cannot take from any man part of his property without consent."

One cannot emphasize too much the importance and centrality of this concept in the ideas of Locke and, down to this day in the western democratic ideology Government exists totally (or certainly primarily) to preserve the individual's right to hold and enjoy property. And government itself cannot take the individual's property without his consent.

Let it be written on the tablet of our hearts and minds that the epitome of "property" is surely the very body and life of the individual. If government is committed to preserving "property", then that 'property" means, first and foremost, life and body. We will return to that later.

And that which western liberal and democratic thinking has built, it also can dissolve. And so Locke lays down the rule that a breach of the social contract by government leads to a dissolution of the contract and an end to the legitimacy of government and its authority over the individual. Yes, western democratic thinking, to which Israel's secular leaders pay obeisance and homage, legitimizes and, indeed, blesses revolution and the rising up of the people against a government that betrayed its word. In the words of Locke:

"There is, therefore, secondly, another way whereby governments are dissolved, and that is when the legislative or the prince, either of them act contrary to their trust."

"First, the legislative acts against the trust reposes in them when they endeavor to invade the property of the subject, and to make themselves or any part of the community masters or arbitrary disposers of the lives, liberties, or fortunes of the people."

"The reason why men enter into society is the preservation of their property; and the end why they choose and authorize a legislative is that there may be laws made and rules set as guards and fences to the properties of all the members of the society to limit the power and moderate the dominion of every part and member of the society; for since it can never be supposed to be the will of the society that the legislative should have a power to destroy that which every one designs to secure by entering into society, and for which the people submitted themselves to legislators of their own making. Whenever the legislators endeavor to take away and destroy the property of the people, or to reduce them to slavery under arbitrary power, they put

themselves into a state of war with the people who are thereupon absolved from any further obedience, and are left to the common refuge which God has provided for all men against force and violence. Whensoever, therefore, the legislative shall transgress this fundamental rule of society, and either by ambition, fear, folly, or corruption endeavor to grasp themselves, or put into the hands of any other, an absolute power over the lives, liberties, and estates of the people, by this breach of trust they forfeit the power the people had put into their hands for quite contrary ends, and it devolves to the people, who have a right to resume their original liberty and, but the establishment of a new legislative such as they shall think fit, provide for their own safety and security which is the end for which they are in society."

The doctrine of revolution or rising up against a government that had turned illegitimate through the breaking of its word, through the dissolution of the social contract, is a fundamental one, that has been accepted as a kind of secular Holy Grail by the west and by the secular Israeli establishment that piously accepts its sacrament.

"The people are absolved from obedience when illegal attempts are made upon their liberties or properties," declares Locke. Let us burn that into our memories as we contemplate the situation inside Israel and again let us never forget that "liberties and property" begin with the freedom to live in safety and security.

The sermon of Locke on the English mount, spread rapidly throughout a world in turmoil that eagerly used it as justification for rising up against the ancien regime, whether in Europe or across the sea, in the American colonies.

In the latter, men like Thomas Paine readily adopted the new ideas and concepts. Paine, in his "Common Sense", wrote:

"Some writers have so confounded society with government, as to leave little or no distinction between them; whereas they are not only different, but have different origins. Society is produced by our wants, and government by our wickedness..."

Society in every state is a blessing, but government even in its best state is but a necessary evil; in its worst state an intolerable one; For when we suffer, or are exposed to the same miseries by a government, which we might expect in a country without government, our calamity is heightened by reflecting that we furnish the means by which we suffer... [Man]... finds it necessary to surrender up a part of his property to furnish means for the protection of the rest; and this he is induced to do by the same prudence which in every other case advises him out of two evils to choose the least. Wherefore, security being the true design and end of government, it unanswerable follows, that whatever form thereof appears most likely to insure it to us, with the least expense and greatest benefit, is preferable to all others..."

"Here then is the origin and rise of government; namely a mode rendered necessary by the inability of moral virtue to govern the world; here too, is the design and end of government, viz. freedom and security."

And when the American colonists rebelled against the British monarchy of George III, they adopted the ideas of individual rights and that of rebellion in the Declaration of Independence.

"When in the Course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station, to which the Laws of Nature and of God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation."

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure their rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a design to reduce them under Absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security..."

"We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved..."

Perhaps an even more remarkable statement on the right of the people to rebel can be found in a letter from Thomas Jefferson, main architect of the Declaration of Independence, written to William S. Paris On November 13, 1787. The United States of America was already established and in the difficult early years, a tax rebellion had been led in the state of Massachusetts by a war veteran named Daniel Shays. Jefferson devoted himself to this rebellion when he wrote:

"God forbid we should ever be twenty years without such a rebellion. The people cannot be all, and always, well-informed. The part which is wrong will be discontented in proportion to the importance of the facts they misconceive. If they remain quiet under such misconceptions, it is a lethargy, the fore-runner of death to the public liberty... And what country can preserve its liberties if its rulers are not warned from time to time that this people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. The remedy is to set them right as to facts, pardon and pacify them. What signify a few lives lost in a century or two? The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants. It is a natural manure..."

Remarkable.

The American Revolution that declared that the authority of government was justified only if it preserved the rights of all individuals to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and which justified revolution when government violated its obligations, deeply influenced an angry and unhappy France which, itself, rose up in revolution, executing the king and queen and, in 1798, convened a National Assembly that produced a Declaration of the Rights of Man. These laid down "natural, sacred and inalienable rights," which were defined as "Liberty, Property, Security and Resistance to Oppression." The latter clearly implied that any government could be legitimately overthrown (as was the French monarchy) when it trampled upon individual liberty.

The spiritual philosopher of the French Revolution was Jean Jacques Rousseau, whose Social Contract was a kind of Bible for those who overthrew the ancien order Among Rousseau's ideas were:

"For to admit that Might makes Right is to reverse the process of affect and cause. The mighty man who defeats his rival becomes heir to his Right. So soon as we can disobey with impunity disobedience become legitimate. And, since the Mightiest is always right, it merely remains for us to become possessed of Might. But what validity can there be in a Right which ceases to exist when Might changes hands? If a man be constrained by Might to obey, what need has he to obey by Duty? And if he is not constrained to obey there is no further obligation on him to do so. It follows, therefore, that the word Right adds nothing to the idea of Might. It becomes, in this connection, completely meaningless..."

"It must, then, be admitted that Might does not create Right, and that no man is under an obligation to obey any but the legitimate powers of the State."

And again:

"To say that a man gives himself for nothing is to commit oneself to an absurd and inconceivable statement. Such an act of surrender is illegitimate, null and void by the mere fact that he who makes it is not in his right mind. To say the same thing of a whole People is tantamount to admitting that the People in question are a nation of imbeciles. Imbecility does not produce Right."

"Even if a man can alienate himself, he cannot alienate his children. They are born free, their liberty belongs to them, and no one but themselves has a right to dispose of it. Before they have attained the age of reason their father may make, on their behalf, certain rules with a view to ensuring their preservation and well-being. But any such limitation of their freedom of choice must be regarded as neither irrevocable nor unconditional, for to alienate another~ liberty is contrary to the natural order, and is an abuse of the father's rights. It follows that an arbitrary government can be legitimate only on condition that each successive generation of subjects is free either to accept or to reject it, and if this is so, then the government will no longer be arbitrary..."

"Such services as the citizen owes to the State must be rendered by him whenever the sovereign demands. But the sovereign cannot lay upon its subjects any burden not necessitated by the well-being of the community."

This overview of modern western democratic thought is made for two reasons: One, because the situation inside Israel is rapidly disintegrating as attacks on Jews, combined with governmental failure or refusal to deal with the problem, threatens the safety and security of citizens there, a thing that many Jews may claim undermines the most basic obligation of government. Two, because Israel, as a secular, democratic state, accepts the above doctrine of freedom as warp and woof of its ideology. Given this, it should not be surprising if voices-more and more-will arise to demand the implementation of the social contract in its entirety, and it would be difficult to understand the government of secular, western democracy rejecting the roots of its own alleged political philosophy.

Chapter 9: Government in the Eyes of Judaism

One brief, but most important aside.

Sadly, tragically the state of Israel is not a Jewish one, in the sense that it rejects the halachic, Torah basis of Judaism. That the state and all those in it will suffer terrible tragedy because of this is clear, but for the moment, that is not the issue. What is important at this juncture is to understand the viewpoint of Judaism on the origins and authority of government and on the rights and obligations to authority by the individual.

In terms of Judaism, and its unique political system of authority and government, none of the above discussion of western, secular view of government is relevant. Judaism and the Jewish concept of government that is rooted in Jewish law know nothing of a social compact or contract as the basis of government. Judaism certainly does not draw its ideas from gentile philosophers and thinkers, and it establishes as the fundamental basis of government neither people nor ruler. It is certainly not democracy or oligarchy or monarchy or indeed any other "system" that is sacred in the eyes of the Jewish Torah, since the basis of government, just as with every other phase of human life, is the law of G~d.

For Judaism, the origin of the Jewish people as a nation is neither natural nor evolutionary and ultimate authority does not rest on anything that comes from within themselves but rather from a source from outside of themselves.

There is a precise moment in time when the Jewish people became a nation-and a particular, special one at that:

"Now, therefore, if you will obey My voice and guard My covenant then shall you be a special treasure unto me above all other peoples, for all the earth is Mine. And you shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation..."

" And all the people answered together and said: All that the L~rd has spoken we will do..." (Exodus 19:5-8).

And the specific, directed and planned extra-natural moment of birth of the people was re-emphasized as Moses approached his death, when he said:

"You stand this day all of you before the L~rd your G~d, your heads of your tribes, your elders and your officers-all the men of Israel. Your little ones, your wives and the convert that is in your camp; from the hewer of your wood to the drawer of your water. In order that you should enter into the covenant of the L~rd your G~d and into His oath which the L~rd, your Gd makes with you this day That He may establish you this day as a people unto Himself and that He maybe unto you a G~d. (Deuteronomy 29:9-12).

That was the specific moment of creation of the Jewish people. It was a specific, supernatural planned moment of precise begin-ning and the creation came from outside of the people so that the ultimate authority and right to decide its fate and future comes not from its own will-as with all others-but from the outside force that created it-G~d. The creation of the people was as the result of a treaty with G~d, and that treaty created a very special kind of people committed to obedience to the laws and statutes of G~d and to accepting the authority of the ultimate authority.

That ultimate authority is absolute and not subject to any limitations and contradictions. It is Malchut shamayim, the kingdom of heaven, and the Jew is exhorted to take upon himself the yoke of the kingdom of heaven. As stated so succinctly in the Talmud:

"Rabbi Yehoshua ben Karcha said: Why does the paragraph of Sh'ma precede the paragraph of V'haya im shamo'a (in the daily prayers)? In order that one might take upon himself the yoke of the kingdom of heaven before taking upon himself the yoke of the commandments..." (Brachot II, 3).

Torah is the authority and its laws bind the Jew and govern him. In order that he may know and recognize his authority and his ultimate government, in order that he may recognize that the laws of the real authority are binding and unchallengeable, he pledges allegiance daily to the government, to the constitution, to the authority He pledges: "Hear O Israel, the L~rd our G~d, the L~rd is One." He pledges allegiance and takes upon himself, daily the yoke of the

kingdom of heaven. The kingdom of heaven. The Torah laws. This is the ultimate authority of the Jewish people. Certainly there is a human, finite, natural government of men which carries out the daily law and order of the people. But just as the people themselves-who surely stand over their natural, elected leaders whom they choose to govern them-are subject to the ultimate authority of Torah Law, so too-and how much more so-is the government of the people which is ultimately inferior to the men who choose them, subjected to an inferior role vis-à-vis the ultimate authority of heaven. Even if we were to conclude that natural government stands in a position of pater familias to the people, it cannot ever be in a stronger position than the pater of the individual himself, concerning whom it is written:

"You shall fear, every man, his mother and his father and keep My Sabbaths; I am the L~rd, your G~d." (Leviticus 19:3)

And the Talmud (Yebamot 5) states:

"Is it possible that the honor of a father and mother shall take precedence over the Sabbath? No, for the verse says: You shall fear... All of you are obligated to honor Me."

And the great Commentator, Rashi, adds:

"Though I have warned you concerning the fear of parents, if they tell you to violate the Sabbath, do not listen. And thus is it with all the other commandments." (Leviticus, Ibid.)

And so is it with the government of the people of Israel, that government whose origin is derived from the Torah and whose major function is to preserve internal order and defend against external enemies so that the Jew may fulfill his heavenly duties in peace. The obligation to respect and obey natural government is clear but only to the extent that the government itself respects and obeys the Law, the constitution, the kingdom of heaven which is the ultimate authority for both the Jewish people and the government that it has chosen for itself.

The origin of Jewish government is found in Deuteronomy 17:15:

"You shall put over you a king whom the L~rd thy G~d shall choose."

And Maimonides brings down this commandment of government (Hilehot Mlachim 1:1) and explicitly defines the authority invested in the king and the respect that is due to him:

"The king is accorded great respect and his awe and fear are placed in the heart of every man... (Ibid, 2:1) Should anyone rebel against the king, the king has the right to kill him... and similarly should anyone be in contempt of or humiliate the king, the king has the right to kill him." (Ibid, 3:8).

The authority and power of the king, the government, are clear; as are the limitations:

And it shall be, when he sits upon the throne of his kingdom that he shall write for himself a copy of this Mishne Torah [Deuteronomy]-and it shall be with him and he shall read from it all the days of his life, tat he may learn to fear the L~rd his G~d, to keep all the words of this Law and these statues to do them. That his heart be not lifted up above his brethren and that he turn not aside from the commandment, either to the right or to the left, so that he may prolong his days in his kingdom, he and his children in the midst of Israel." (Deuteronomy 17:18-20).

The people must respect and fear their government but their government, their king, must "learn to fear the L~rd, his G~d" and "turn not aside from the commandment."

The Torah stays with the king, physically lest he forget for one moment who is his king, who governs him. And the Prophet Samuel told the people as he appointed for them their first king:

*"But if you shall do wickedly you shall be consumed, both you and your king."
(Samuel 1, 12:25).*

And the government, the king, indeed loses his authority and the right to rule when disobeying G~d:

*"Then came the word of the L~rd unto Samuel, saying: I regret that I have set up Saul as king for he has turned back from following Me and not performed My word..."
(Ibid. 15).*

And Samuel faced his king, the government, and said:

"The L~rd has rent the kingdom of Israel from you this day..." (Ibid.)

The authority of the king, of government, rests on the assumption that the king will obey the higher authority. When he disobeys it, his own authority is no longer valid and this is explicitly taught (Sanhedrin 49):

"It is written: 'Any man that shall disobey you and not hearken unto your words in all that you shall command him, shall die' (Joshua 1:18). Can this also apply to the words of the Torah [i.e. if the authority orders to disobey the words of the Torah]? No, for the verse says: Only be strong and courageous [to keep the Torah]."

The explanation of Rashi is categorical:

"If the king desires to negate the words of the Torah, we do not listen to him."

Maimonides codifies this in Hilchot Mlachim 3:9, stating:

"If one disregards an order of the king because he is engrossed in mitzvot (commandments), even a minor mitzvah, he is free from sin for when faced with the words of the master (G~d) and the words of the servant (the king) the words of the master take precedence. And there is no need to say that if the king ordered him to negate a mitzvah that he does not listen to him."

The obligation to listen to, obey and respect the authority of government rests upon whether that government, in a particular case, is itself obeying the Torah, the need of the people. Thus we find (Bava Batra 4) the story of Herod killing the Rabbis in his fear that they would revolt against him. One, Bava ben Buta, was left alive after first being blinded. The paranoid Herod came to him, disguising his identity and urged him to curse Herod. Bava ben Buta objected, saying:

"It says: 'Thou shalt not curse a ruler amongst thy people.' (Exodus 22).

And Herod replies:

"But that is only if the ruler does acts that are acts of the people, and Herod does not."

And Bava Ben Buta accepted the argument saying only that he was afraid. "When the ruler does acts of the people." This is the criterion for not obeying the authority of the government in a particular case, and while people cannot simply take it upon themselves to decide that the government is not doing 'acts of the people' merely because their own political views differ,

certainly the rule is clear when the government disobeys the Torah, thus guaranteeing disaster and suffering for the people.

Among the most basic of all concepts in Torah Judaism is that of life. When the Torah (Leviticus 18:5) decrees: "Ye shall keep My statutes and Mine ordinances, which if a man do, he shall live by them; I am the L~rd," the Rabbis (Talmud, Yuma 85b) declare:

"From whence do we know that the saving of a life transcends (the observance of) the Sabbath? Because it declares: 'Ye shall keep My statutes and Mine ordinances, which if a man do, he shall live by them.' (He shall live by them) and not die by them."

In Judaism there is a basic right to live, for the magnificent reason that there is a basic obligation to live, in order to carry out G~d's will. And certainly, it is the most basic of obligations in Judaism for the king or government to defend Jewish lives and property. This is referred to as an obligatory war as Maimonides says (Hilchot Mlachim 5:1): "The king gives precedence to an obligatory war (as opposed to a voluntary one). And what is considered an obligatory war? The war against the seven (Canaanite) nations, the war against Amalek, and aiding Jews against an enemy that rises against them."

Indeed, it was for protection against their enemies that the Jews demanded that Samuel appoint for them a king, as they declared: (Samuel I, 8): "That we may also be like all the nations and that our king may judge us and go out before us and fight our battles."

Certainly that is a primary obligation of a king, of government, in Judaism. (And the reason that Samuel was angered at the request for a king was that the Jews, in asking for one, did so not because it was a commandment of G~d but because they rejected Samuel and desired to be like all the nations." (See Maimonides, Hilchot Mlachim 1:2)

And certainly when the king or government fails to protect the people from "the enemy that rises against them," in Judaism's eyes it has failed to live up to its obligation to the people. And certainly, when it refuses to allow the people to defend themselves and, indeed, jails those who do, it loses the right to demand of the people obedience to orders that go against the Torah command of self-preservation, of "he shall live by them" and not die by them.

The question of democracy itself, i.e. majority rule and the fact that a majority of Jews has the moral and legal right to decide any question and then demand acceptance of that decision, is discussed in Sanhedrin 26.

When Sennacherib and the Assyrians invaded the Land of Israel and surrounded Jerusalem, a fierce debate erupted over whether to surrender or not. King Hezekiah, under the prodding of the Prophet Isaiah, refused to surrender despite the overwhelming strength of the mightiest empire of its day, one that swept over every nation it had faced. Shevna, a scribe, and one of the powers of the government, on the other hand, urged surrender. Each group took its cause to the people and this is the background for the following words of the Talmud:

"What does the concept keshet r'shayim, a band of wicked people, mean?"

"Shevna gathered together and spoke to 130,000 people (who supported him) while Hezekiah gathered (only) 110,000 people. When Sennacherib laid siege to the city, Shevna wrote the following message and sent it by arrow to the enemy camp: 'Shevna and his party have capitulated; Hezekiah and his party have not.'"

"Hezekiah was fearful and thought: 'Is it possible, heaven forbid, that G~d's will tends toward the majority and since the majority wishes to surrender, we must too?' Then there came to him a prophet and quoted the verse: 'Do not recognize as a

band, all that which the people call a band; neither fear ye their fear nor be afraid.'
(Isaiah 8:12) Meaning, this is a band of wicked people, and a band of wicked people
is not counted"

A majority of those who go against the law of the Jewish people is not a majority and, indeed, it is they who have broken the law when they decide to oppose the law of the Jewish people to forbid that which is obligatory and oblige that which is forbidden. It is they who defy the law, it is they who break down order. It is they who create a jungle of anarchy and it is they who bring down disaster and Divine punishment on the Jewish people. It is not a question of Jews disobeying a government that defies the law but it certainly is a question of Jews who wish to obey the law, defying a government that violates the law while attempting to prevent Jews from obeying the law. It is a question of Jews demanding that the government, if it will not itself do what it should, allow, at least, individuals to do so.

It is a question of disregarding a majority that is not a majority, that is not counted, for it emerges from 'the band of wicked people.'

The Jewish concept of government is clear: The government exists to serve the state. The state exists to serve the people. The people exist to serve G~d. The moment that the people fail in their obligation, law and order breaks down and Divine punishment must follow. The moment that government opposes the law it creates anarchy and loses all moral and legal right to demand obedience from the citizen who desires to be law-abiding. When the government demands that a Jew disobey a law, he must disregard the illegal order.

When the government refuses to allow a Jew to obey a legal obligation, he must defy the illegal attempt.

Yes, this is halacha, and Israel is, unfortunately not a state of halacha, but much closer to a state of anarchy.

What emerges, however, is that despite the basic difference between Judaism and the secular concept of government, both are agreed upon upon one basic axiom:

Government is obligated to protect the lives and property of Jews who are threatened, and failure to do so is a basic breach of that obligation. Both Judaism and liberal, democratic western thought agree that the individual, in order to protect himself, may disregard a government that refuses to protect him, and that-worse-prevents him from saving himself.

The government must be prepared to expect individuals to raise these issues, and it must have answers for them.

Chapter 10: Just and Unjust Laws

From time immemorial, men have defied the law of men, the Authority of their time, in the name of a higher Law, a higher Authority: and examples abound of civil disobedience to authority, based on conscience or a sense of injustice.

In ancient Greece, it was Antigone who is depicted as having defied an edict by the ruler, Creon, to forbid the burial of a Greek. For her, that decree meant a continued torture of the spirit, and so she consciously violated the rule. And throughout the ages, civil disobedience has raised its head and banner as 'the deliberate violation of law for a vital social purpose,' (Howard Zinn, "DISOBEDIENCE AND DEMOCRACY").

We have made Judaism's view of disobedience to temporal authority abundantly clear. Human authority that goes against the Law of G~d, is illegitimate. It is more than an unjust law, it is

not a law at all.

Non-Jewish thinkers, in various ways, have agreed. Aquinas said flatly "an unjust law is no law at all." His words were echoed by Martin Luther King in his "LETTER FROM BIRMINGHAM JAIL":

"One may well ask: 'How can you advocate breaking some laws and obeying others? The answer lies in the fact that there are two types of laws: just and unjust. I would be the first to advocate obeying just laws. Conversely, one has a moral responsibility to disobey unjust laws. I would agree with St. Augustine that 'an unjust law is no law at all.'"

It is certainly clear that an unjust law is not only not a law but that there is a moral right and, indeed, obligation, to stand up against it. And surely, there is not a decent human being who does not praise those Germans who rose against the legally elected Nazi government and all the others who defied totalitarian regimes no matter how "legal" they may have been in terms of their support on the part of the majority population.

Nor is the fact that a society is nominally democratic," i.e. that it has a framework that allows for change, any necessary bar to defiance of unjust laws or policy. Certainly the United States of the nineteenth century had the political system to outlaw slavery, and nevertheless John Brown's raid at Harper's Ferry and the citizen who aided slaves to escape their legal masters showed that many American⁵ had no patience with the theoretical opportunity to effect legal, ordered, political change, when injustice thrived at that moment.

It is certainly true that the United States had the framework for electoral and political change during the era of civil disobedience that was the hallmark of both the Civil Rights Movement and the Vietnam demonstrations, and indeed, it certainly was argued that change could and should have been made through the electoral process. Nevertheless, the advocates of civil disobedience pointed out that riot only was the reality of the political system one that gave the establishment a terribly unfair advantage over those who sought change; not only was it terribly unjust to have people continue to suffer injustice while the mills of the politicians ground slowly but there was something far more fundamental involved here:

Unjust laws were not simply the target of change through the political process. For those who defied them, they did not exist. By definition, they were not laws, hence, in opposing them one was not violating anything.

Certainly, logic dictates that opposition to injustice and to threats to basic rights and life can take many forms, perhaps any form. In that sense the term "civil disobedience" is a wide one and has been so defined. "Among the forms civil disobedience has taken have been revolution, regicide, 'underground resistance,' riots, strikes, picketing, refusal to obey superior orders, boycotts of commodities, hunger strikes, freedom rides, marches, sit-ins, protest meetings, and simply non-compliance." (Mark R. MacGuigan, "Civil Disobedience and Natural Law," Catholic Lawyer 11(1965): 120).

Others such as Gandhi and King limit the concept to public non-violent violation of law. It is evident that there is more of practicality than logic to this latter definition. Surely, if injustice exists, and people suffer because of it, why should civil disobedience be limited to non violent violation of law? Indeed, violation of the law of the state is, itself, such a serious thing, such a threat to the stability of the political order, that one wonders what makes the addition of "violence," a thing that is verboten?

It is obvious that those who limited and limit civil disobedience to non-violent confrontation and disobedience understood that on the one hand it would be much more difficult for the state to take the kind of oppressive and brutal actions to crush it (that it would so like to use) and on the other hand the chances of gaining sympathy of large numbers of citizens are much greater when

there is no violence involved. And that is what comes through from the words of Gandhi when he writes: "We must therefore give its full and therefore greater value to the adjective 'civil' than to 'disobedience.' Disobedience without civility, discipline, discrimination, non-violence is certain destruction."

Pragmatism far more than morality or logic is clearly what lies at the basis of those who demand non-violence as the rationale for violating the law. Yet, no matter how one attempts to avoid the unpleasant implications, civil disobedience is defiance of authority, a violation of the law and a shaking of order, albeit as a form of resistance to the unlawful actions or policy of the state. Violence merely raises that action to a different plane, but whether accompanied by violence or not, defiance of authority and its law of any kind involves a shaking of the basis of society. The question however is: Is society more important than justice? Does authority per se, stand higher than the laws and policy it imposes upon the people?

Henry David Thoreau became the symbol of civil disobedience in the United States in the nineteenth century opposing both the Mexican War and slavery. He refused to pay his poll tax to the State of Massachusetts and because of this spent a night in jail. Not perhaps the most dramatic of suffering or martyrdom but the point was made. Thoreau had deliberately defied the authority of the government.

It was part of a far wider defiance of the authority of the government of the United States. At an anti-slavery meeting in Framingham on July 4, 1854, William Lloyd Garrison, publisher of the Abolitionist newspaper, *The Liberator* burned the U.S. Constitution as "a covenant with death and hell." When the Fugitive Slave Act in 1850 made it legally incumbent on Northerners to act as slave catchers, Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote: "I will not obey it, by G~d" indeed, not only did American citizens refuse to obey the law of the land and catch the fugitive slaves, but a well organized "underground railway" was established to help the slaves flee to Canada. An entire section of the American population was knowingly and readily defying authority.

In October 1859, the abolitionist John Brown seized the U.S. Arsenal at Harper's Ferry in Virginia in an attempt to arm and free the slaves. He was captured and executed, but to the Abolitionists, this man and his act of sedition were the stuff of martyrdom, courage and the rising up against the injustice of the state.

It was Thoreau who laid the philosophical basis for defiance of government of his time, writing: 'Are laws to be enforced simply because they were made? Or declared by any number of men to be good, if they are not good?' And again: "Let each inhabitant of the state dissolve his union with her so long as she delays to do her duty."

In his classic "ON THE DUTY OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE" Thoreau wrote:

"Government is at best but an expedient; but most governments are usually and all governments are sometimes, inexpedient."

Asking the question, "Must the citizen even for a moment, or in the least degree, resign his conscience to the legislator? Why has every man a conscience, then?" He contemptuously described the citizens of the land in this way:

"The mass of men serve the state, not as men mainly, but as machines with their bodies... Such command no more respect than men of straw or a lump of dirt. They have the same sort of worth only as horses or dogs. Yet such as these even are commonly esteemed good citizens. A very few... serve the state with their consciences, also, and so necessarily resist it for the most part; and they are commonly treated as enemies by it."

And then Thoreau touches on a vitally important historical point, one that is so often overlooked. So many great revolutions, including the American one, came into being for property rights. And

noting this, Thoreau asks, if that is a reason to revolt, is there not an even greater reason to rise up for such moral issues as slavery in the United States and what he saw as an imperialist war against Mexico:

"All men recognize the right of revolution; that is, the right to refuse allegiance to, and to resist the government, when its tyranny or its efficiency are great and unendurable. But almost all say that such is not the case now. But such was the case, they think in the Revolution of '75. If one were to tell me that this was a bad government because it taxed certain foreign commodities brought to its ports, it is most probable that I should not make an ado about it, for I can do without them. All machines have their friction; and possibly this does enough good to counterbalance the evil. At any rate, it is a great evil to make a stir about it. But when the friction comes to have its machine, and oppression and robbery are organized, I say, let us not have such a machine any longer. In other words, when a sixth of the population of a nation which has undertaken to be the refuge of liberty are slaves, and a whole country is unjustly overrun and conquered by a foreign army, and subjected to military law, I think that it is not too soon for honest men to rebel and revolutionize."

Thoreau moves on to touch upon the question of patiently using the system to amend and reform evil rather than turning to rebellion or civil disobedience:

"As for adopting the ways which the State has provided for remedying the evil, I know not of such ways. They take too much time, and a man's life will be gone. I have other affairs to attend to. I came into this world, not chiefly to make this a good place to live in, but to live in it, be it good or bad. A man has not everything to do, but something; and because he cannot do everything, it is not necessary that he should do something wrong. It is not my business to be petitioning the Governor or the Legislature any more than it is theirs to petition me; and if they should not hear my petition, what should I do then? But in this case the State has provided no way: its very Constitution is the evil. This may seem to be harsh and stubborn and un-conciliatory; but it is to treat with the utmost kindness and consideration the only spirit that can appreciate or deserve it. So is all change for the better, like birth and death, which convulse the body."

"I do not hesitate to say, that those who call themselves Abolitionists should at once effectually withdraw their support, both in person and property, from the government of Massachusetts, and not wait till they constitute a majority of one, before they suffer the right to prevail through them. I think that it is enough if they have a God on their side, without waiting for that other one. Moreover, any man more right than his neighbors constitutes a majority of one already."

It is an ironic thing, of course, that Thoreau supported a pro-posal to have Massachusetts secede from the United States over the existence of slavery while the whole South did secede over the attempt to limit and bar slavery. Both used the argument that an unjust and tyrannical state could not impose its will on the conscience of citizens. Both said that there were certain inalienable rights of the individual that were inviolate. Thoreau spoke of the inviolability of freedom. The South spoke of the inviolability of property.

Thoreau became the guru for rebels with all manners of causes in the United States, and his clear sanction of revolt and civil disobedience became a very real thing in the turbulent years of the battle over Civil Rights and Vietnam that began in the latter half of the 1950's and continued through until past 1970. The United States authority was shaken in those years as never since the Civil War. Civil disobedience, whether in its non-violent form of Martin Luther King or in its very violent Chicago riots, defied the law, defied authority, and challenged the state and what it perceived as its immoral laws and policies.

Martin Luther King, a young Black minister from a pastoral family in Atlanta, became the apostle of non-violent civil disobedience as the battle for civil rights erupted in the United States in the 1950's. Again, while his adulators emphasize the non-violent aspect of his life, it should not be forgotten that what mattered more in terms of the success he achieved, was the civil disobedience, the breaking of laws considered to be immoral or unjust. King, himself was quite clear about this, saying:

"There is nothing that expressed massive civil disobedience any more than the Boston Tea Party and yet we give this to our young people and our students as a part of the great tradition of our nation. So I think we are in good company when we break unjust laws and I think those who are willing to do it and pay the penalty are those who are part of the saving of the nation."

The concept of mass civil disobedience was, for King, the most effective way to force government to change. Thus he wrote:

"Mass civil disobedience as a new stage of struggle can transmute the deep rage of the ghetto into a constructive and creative force. To dislocate the functioning of a city without destroying it can be more effective than a riot because it can be longer, costly to the larger society but not wantonly destructive. Finally it is a device of social action that is more difficult for the government to quell by superior force."

By any other name, Martin Luther King was talking of rebellion against the unjust laws of government. For that he won a Nobel Peace Prize and became only the second man in American history whose birthday became a national holiday. His name is fairly sacred in the halls of the liberal and humanist camps. And why? For defying the authority of the state in the name of freedom.

The defiance of American governmental authority that eventually led to such sweeping changes in American society began on December 1, 1955 with the breaking of the law by Mrs. Rosa Parks, a simple Black seamstress. The Montgomery, Alabama City Bus Lines required Blacks to sit and stand at the rear of the buses even if there were empty seats in the front section, reserved for Whites. Parks, sitting in the first row behind the section reserved for Whites, was ordered to get up and give her seat to a white man. She refused and was arrested. History was now about to be made as an unjust law was defied and broken.

King, who was pastor of the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, offered his church for a meeting of Black community leaders. There, a decision was made to break yet another law. It was decided to boycott the bus line unless it changed its segregated seating system. There was, of course, an anti-boycott law on the books of the state of Alabama, but again-a struggle for justice took precedence over the laws of an unjust authority King was jailed, tried and found guilty of violating the law. M. L. King, case number 7399, had ruled that defiance of illegal unjust authority was moral.

On October 29, 1960, Black students launched what they called "the Second Battle of Atlanta," invading segregated department stores and food counters. King was arrested for breaking the law.

In 1961 the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) launched what it called Freedom Rides across the South to challenge the segregation laws. Hundreds were arrested for challenging the authority of local and state governments.

In Albany Georgia, in Birmingham and Selma, Alabama; in Jackson, Mississippi, Black and White civil rights activists broke laws over and over again and were arrested. King was sentenced to five days in prison for contempt of court. Nine hundred Black children, some as young as seven and eight, marched in Birmingham without a permit and were arrested. The next day a larger

march was attacked by police with water hoses. Blacks in anger threw bricks and bottles at the police who charged into the crowd, loosing vicious dogs.

Martin Luther King and the Civil Rights activists broke the law, disrupted law and order, challenged government and authority and King became an international hero. In response to the question, why not "wait" and change the law legally and peacefully, he said:

"For years now we have heard the word 'Wait!' It rings in the ear of the Negro with piercing familiarity. Perhaps it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say 'Wait.' But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim; when you have seen hate-filled policemen curse, kick, and even kill your black brothers and sisters; when you see the vast majority of your twenty million Negro brothers smothering in an airtight cage of poverty in the midst of an affluent society when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of 'nobodiness'-then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait."

The argument for civil disobedience and the defying of government, law and authority was stated by King in terms of the right of people to demand freedom and justice in the face of injustice and inequality. In three different writings he declared:

"It is time that we stopped our blithe lip service to the guarantees of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These fine sentiments are embodied in the Declaration of Independence, but that document was always a declaration of intent rather than of reality... Negro agitation is requiring America to reexamine its comforting myths and may yet catalyze the drastic reforms that will save us from social catastrophe."

"There comes a time when people get tired of being trampled by oppression, There comes a time when people get tired of being plunged into the abyss of exploitation and bagging injustice. The story of Montgomery is the story of fifty thousand such Negroes who were willing to substitute tired feet for tired souls, and walk the streets of Montgomery until the walls of segregation were finally battered by the forces of justice."

"Our freedom was not won a century ago, it is not won today; but some small part of it is in our hands, and we are marching no longer by ones and twos but in legions of thousands, convinced now it cannot be denied by any human force."

"Today the question is not whether we shall be free but by what course we will win. In the recent past our struggle has had two phases. The first phase began in the early 1950's when Negroes slammed the door shut on submission and subservience. Adapting nonviolent resistance to conditions in the United States, we swept into Southern streets to demand our citizenship and manhood. For the South, with its complex system of brutal segregation, we were inaugurating a rebellion. Merely to march in public streets was to rock the status quo to its roots. Boycotting buses in Montgomery; demonstrating in Birmingham, the citadel of segregation; and defying guns, dogs, and clubs in Selma, while maintaining disciplined nonviolence, totally confused the rulers of the South. If they let us march, they admitted their lie that the black man was content. If they shot us down, they told the world they were inhuman brutes."

The struggle in the United States over the Vietnam War led to a whole host of acts of civil disobedience ranging from the burning of draft cards, the refusal to serve in the army, the blocking of troop trains, the taking over of campus buildings (sometimes with deans and professors locked in) and, of course, real rioting and bitter violence as at the 968 Democratic Convention in Chicago. The Catonsville Nine destroyed draft records as did the so-called East

Coast Conspiracy to Save Lives. They claimed that they wished "to disrupt functioning of the machine of death and oppression."

One of the leaders of the anti-Vietnam War protests was William Sloane Coffin, Jr., who wrote:

"I think we must recognize that massive civil disobedience to the war would represent not only an effort to arouse a confused and inert public, but really a form of jiu-jitsu, an effort on the part of the minority to morally coerce the majority into a greater consciousness of the issues of the war."

One of King's most telling points was that "waiting" was ineffective because the Authority government does not wish to move swiftly to undo the injustice and change policy. Thus, in August, 1967 he declared: "Our real problem is that there is no disposition by the administration or Congress to seek fundamental remedies."

In light of this and all the above, Jews in the Jewish State have every reason to ask:

If the great thinkers who laid the groundwork for the relationship between government and individual agreed that man has the right to rise up against an Authority that robs him of his rightful property;

If the men democracies honor so-Locke and Rousseau and Jefferson and Thoreau and King-cried out the moral and natural right of people to defy government over freedom, equality, morality and property;

If the right to challenge, defy, disobey and fight against Authority is valid even in issues that do not involve a real threat to life and existence-

Is it not then certainly valid and just and obligatory to defy an Authority that lays down a policy that threatens the very lives of citizens!

Is it not legitimate to challenge an Authority which is either unable or unwilling to put an end to a terror that takes the lives of citizens and that threatens the very existence of the state?

Is not the most basic right the right to life and is not the essence of property the possession that is life?

Is not a government that endangers life through its inept policy and that then prevents the citizen from exerting all means at his command to insure that life, a government that has lost legitimacy and that must be challenged?

And if a law or laws can be a reason for defiance of government, what shall be the fate of an Authority whose entire policy threatens the lives of people?

Surely these are question that are legitimate, though, in the present State of Israel, they are more than capable of inviting arrest. What is important, however, at this point is to know that a challenge to official Authority in the Land of Israel in recent history is nothing new.

Chapter 11: Jewish Authority

The question of defying the official representatives of the Jews in the Land of Israel is hardly a new one. Under the British colonialist mandate, the Jewish community in the land, known as the yishuv, was organized into a corporate entity, Knesset Yisrael, with two elected institutions: Assefat ha'nivcharim (Assembly of the deputies) and Va'ad Leumi (National council), elected by the Assembly Thus, while there was no formal Jewish state, there existed a formal organized structure that claimed to represent the Jews living in the Land of Israel and which performed

governmen-tal-like functions as well as representing the Jews vis-à-vis the British occupiers. In short, there was official Jewish authority in the land.

On April 19, 1936, Arabs in Jaffa began a pogrom, attacking Jews wherever they could find them. Seventeen Jews were murdered that day stabbed or hacked to death. This was the beginning of the Arab intifada, that, except for a relatively brief respite, was to continue until the spring of 1939. More than 510 Jews were massacred in that time; women were raped and brutally violated; hundreds of millions of dollars of property damage was suffered by Jews who saw their houses and fields and forests burned and destroyed. And the most incredible aspect of this horrifying period was the policy of the official Jewish authority. In response to the terror, the murder, the rape, the horror-the official line of the Jewish leadership was havlaga, or self-restraint. In a perverse and insane twisting of morality that is eerily echoed today the concept of revenge as a means of frightening and, indeed, terrorizing the Arab into ceasing his murder of Jews, was equated with the terror of the Arab against innocent Jews. The same twisted ghetto mentality of a people who had left the Exile but were unable to free the Exile from themselves. The same insanity that grips the gentitized and morally castrated assimilated Jew of today, held sway in the years of the intifada of the '30s.

"We are better than they." Indeed; deader, but "better." "Let us not sink to their level." Indeed; we sank six foot below it. In an un-Jewish rejection of the basic Jewish halachic axiom, "If one comes to slay you, slay him first," the Jewish leadership-the elected authority-laid down a policy of suicide and madness. An incredible echo of our times can be heard in the article published in the official publication of the left-wing Hashomer Hatzair publication (September 1, 1937):

"Immediately there sprang forward the various nazis and fascists who multiply in our midst (shades of our times!-MK) in order to give an ideological basis to the irresponsible agitation that wishes to prove that it is proper were we to also become an 'active' factor in the bloody dance that shakes the institutions in our land." The same vituperation and smears; the same immoral and obscene 'ethics' of which the rabbis spoke when they declared: "He who has mercy on the cruel will someday be cruel to the merciful."

The same illegitimate and perverted "morality" that the Jewish scholar Nachmanides (Ramban), warned against when he declared: "For through the mercy of the fools, all justice is lost"

Even members of the Jewish establishment were increasingly troubled. Members of the Haganah, the official defense group of the official Jewish community, grumbled. In the October 30, 1936 edition of its official publication Bamachane, a "member of the ranks" writes:

"Had we understood to reply by smashing and crushing at the right moment, it is certain that their (the Arab) Oriental heat would have lessened and certainly the brazenness and courage of the knife in the back would not have produced so many needless victims... Give us a sign! Smash the shameful line (of havlaga)! For our lives depend on it."

The line was not only not broken, it was strengthened. Jews continued to be murdered, women raped, property destroyed. And the shameful and mad policy of havlaga continued. Until it was broken. With a vengeance. Through vengeance.

The agitation within Haganah for a more active policy had already produced splits and defiances. Now, from the ranks of the group emerged the Irgun Zvai Larni accepting Zionist leader Ze'ev Jabotinsky as its spiritual and philosophical leader. Jabotinsky had been exiled by the British from the land and could not enter. In addition, he had become the target of an unprecedented (until our times) campaign of vilification and slander by the totalitarians of the Left. That did not prevent the Irgun, under its new leader David Raziel, from contemptuously smashing havlaga and in the name of love of Jews who were being massacred, raise high the Jewish hand of attack

and vengeance.

Raziel, a disciple of Betar and its founder Jabotinsky, was a religious Jew from Jerusalem. His father was a Hebrew scholar, and David himself studied in Yeshivat Mercaz Ha'Rav, of the late Rabbi Kook. He watched with bitterness and frustration as Arab attacks grew and Jewish passivity kept pace with it. On May 10, 1937, members of the settlement Beit Yosef in the eastern Emek Yizre'el, were attacked on their way to work. The barley field in Tel Amal was set on fire by Arab gangs. And then, on May 19, on Strauss Street, in the heart of Jerusalem, a Jew was shot down. The Jews of this capital were furious but the official leadership kept them in line with a stiff demand to "observe moral discipline." But this time, the die was cast.

David Raziel, scholar, religious Jew, brilliant military mind and commander of the Irgun, watched as the Arab mobs scorned the Jew as a walad-al-mawt, a child of death, and looked forward to the great slaughter of the Jew "itbach-el-yahud." And Raziel reasoned. If the Arabs shall murder Jews, shall we limit ourselves to driving them off? If we limit ourselves to driving them off, why should they not continue to attack and murder Jews? What deterrent is there in our actions that would persuade them that it is to their interest to cease killing Jews?

And so, one morning, with the cries of the dying and wounded Jewish men, women and children ringing in his ears, David Raziel declared: "As they have done unto me so have I done unto them." The words of Samson, the lesson of Judaism.

In a little room which served as the modest headquarters of the Irgun in Jerusalem, David Raziel sat with a member of his tiny group. Carefully he outlined the plan. The man nodded in understanding. Raziel reached beneath his shirt and took out a re-volver-his personal one. Without a word he handed it to the Irgunist. The latter rose, shook Raziel's hand, and walked out. That morning, at 5:30 AM, an Arab walking past the Menora Club on Bezalel street, was shot dead. The Irgun had broken havlaga; it had determined to avenge Jewish blood with that of the Arab.

The Jewish Establishment, led by the Laborites, reacted with unparalleled fury. The Histadrut paper, Davar in a front-page editorial fumed: "The Yishuv has an obligation to openly declare its bitterness against this obscene action. Only a totally irresponsible gang lacking all public and moral responsibility could do what it did."

Not 24 hours later, the Arab gangs, apparently assured by the official Jewish reaction and considering the Irgun attack to be a one-shot affair, murdered another Jew. He was Avraham Zindani, shot down in cold blood near Lydda. On June 3, Arabs threw a bomb at a Jewish bus going from Meah Shearim to Givat Shaul. By a miracle it did not explode. Meanwhile, throughout the country, murder, rapes, and burning of Jewish fields grew, too, in direct reaction to the official Jewish policy of self-restraint. And David Raziel, knowing this, was preparing for the formal breaking of that policy.

November 6, 1937 marked that day. It became known as Black Sunday to the Arabs and the Mufti. A group of Jews had been attacked in the Old City and now, after months of training and preparation, Raziel's men struck. That day two Arabs walking on Gaza Street in the Rechavya section of Jerusalem were shot down. One was killed and the other wounded. Half an hour later, two Arabs were shot down in the new Beit Yisrael section, while that morning an Arab bus in Romema was attacked by automatic weapon fire, with two Arabs killed.

But there was more. To show that the Irgun was now capable of striking throughout the country, that same day in Haifa, a bomb was thrown into an Arab cafe near the Armon movie-house and two Arabs were shot down in the Wadi Niskas area. The official Jews frothed at the mouth and the Arabs began, for the first time, to walk the streets with trepidation.

The Irgun, small and penniless, hounded by the British authorities and by fellow Jews, slowly

built its strength as the Arab terror spread. Had the Haganah and the official Jewish leadership done what the Irgun wished, terror of an unprecedented scale would have stricken the Arabs into cowering silence. But with the Irgun perceived, still, as a small group, the Arabs continued to discount it and to escalate their murder of Jews. Under the prodding of the Mufti and the Moslem Supreme Court and Higher Committee, gangs began to turn Eretz Yisrael into the country of pogroms that the Zionists had claimed it was meant to stop. Raziel, moving from house to house to escape arrest and Jewish reaction, was slowly building his anti-terror machine. It now struck, to the terror of the Arabs and the anger of the Jews.

On July 6, 1938, time bombs were put in milk cans and placed in the Arab market place in Haifa by an Irgun member dressed as an Arab porter. In the explosion that followed, 21 Arabs were killed and 52 wounded. Terror spread throughout the Arabs of Haifa, among the most vicious of the enemies of Zionism.

The attack was in reaction to the murder of two Jews the previous day in Jerusalem, and the Arabs of Jerusalem were not to be spared. A bomb thrown into a crowd of Arabs on David Street in the Old City killed two and wounded four. Two days later, the Irgun threw a bomb into a crowd of Arabs waiting near the bus terminal near Jaffa Gate. Three were killed and 19 injured. A week later, on a Friday, as Arabs left their mosque at the foot of David Street in the Old City, an electronically detonated mine went off killing ten Arabs and wounding 30.

Official Jewish reaction bordered on the hysterical. The Ichud, made up of intellectuals such as Dr. Judah Magnes of Hebrew University, Martin Buber and others, condemned the Jewish "terrorists" in language they had never used for the Arab gangs. Ben Gurion, Weizman and other Jewish leaders called upon Jews to "wipe out the cancer from our midst." The Irgunists were labeled as "murderers, fascists, and extremists, who were going against the elected majority of Jews. They were henceforth to be known as porshim, those who split from the community.

It had little effect on David Raziel. On July 25, 1938, a 30-kilogram explosive went off in the Arab market place in Haifa. Hidden in a barrel of sour pickles, it killed at least 35 Arabs and wounded 70 more. The Arabs were terrified; the Jews were hysterical. Raziel was content.

One month later, the Irgun switched to Jaffa, a nest of the worst gangs of Arab vipers in the country. An Irgun member, once again dressed as an Arab porter, placed a bomb in the Arab Dir-a-Salach marketplace. The official version listed 21 Arabs dead and 35 wounded. In reality many more went to heaven.

February 27, 1939, proved to be yet another "Black Day" for the Arabs as the Irgun, sensing collapse of Arab terror in the face of Jewish vengeance, attacked in three cities. In Haifa, two powerful explosions went off, one at the ticket window of the railroad station in East Haifa and the other at the Arab market place. At least 27 Arabs were killed. Half-an-hour later in Jerusalem, three Arabs were killed and six wounded in an Irgun explosion on David Street while another died after being attacked on an Arab bus passing Machane Yehuda.

Finally in Tel Aviv, attacks on Arabs near the power station in the north and in the Salama district in the south killed three more.

No one came to symbolize the breaking of havlaga more than a young 18-year-old Jew, named Shlomo Ben Yosef

In the middle of the holiday of Passover 1938, tension rose in the Jewish colony of Rosh Pina, near Safed. Strange Arabs were reported nearby, fields had been set ablaze and there was no doubt that the Arabs of the village of Djani, overlooking the Jewish settlement, were preparing for yet another massacre.

Three young Zionists, Shlomo Ben Yosef, Abraham Shein and Shalom Djuravin, members of the Zionist youth movement Betar, determined to put an end to the passage of strange Arabs through Rosh Pina. On midday of April 21, 1938, they stood watch on the road between Safed and Rosh Pina and saw a bus carrying Arabs from outside the area, approaching. They fired at it, missed, but the bus turned and sped away. The British, so futile at finding Arab terrorists, now swiftly caught the "Jewish one..."

Before the unbelieving eyes of the Jewish community in Zion, the British sentenced Ben Yosef to be hanged. Ordinary Jews marched in protest, gathered in synagogues, pleaded for the life of the lover of Zion. Ben Yosef did not plead. He refused to ask for mercy of a British imperialist government that had no right to be in Zion. The sun rose on the day of June 29, 1938 and Shlomo Ben Yosef, 18 years old, was taken to the gallows of Acre Prison to be hanged. His aged mother in Poland had sent a frantic telegram to the High Commissioner pleading that the hanging be delayed so that she might see her son for the last time. It was turned down by the anti-Zionists.

The Jewish prisoners in their cells watched as the young man walked down the corridor into the courtyard. Suddenly they heard his voice- He was singing "Kol od ba'leyvav pnima... As long as the soul of the Jew throbs, our hope is not yet lost..." Ha'tikvah, the Zionist national anthem. And then silence. The first Zionist to be hanged in the Land of Israel since the days of Rome was dead. But let the name be remembered by all Zionists and anti-Zionists alike. For in his death he raised high the banner of revolt and paved the way for Zion to rise again.

He broke Havlaga; he defied Jewish authority in order to save Jews.

There is more, but the lesson is clear.

David Raziell was a "terrorist," a "murderer" who went against everything that was Jewish. Today one may purchase an Israel national stamp honoring him. And one may visit a settlement due west of Jerusalem named Ramat Raziell and live on Raziell Street in East Talpiot in Jerusalem. And one may hear talks on the glory of Raziell and see a monument of him at the Herut Headquarters on King George Street in Tel Aviv. And one may look up paeans of praise to him from the speeches of Yitzhak Shamir, Menachem Begin and Moshe Arens, even as they condemn Jewish attacks on Arabs. Today in the days of the latest intifada.

Hypocrisy? Of course, but there is more.

The heart of the tale of David Raziell is the fact that murder and terror against Jews, of the kind when the British ruled Eretz Yisrael, have returned to an independent state controlled by the Jews. And that is infinitely more obscene. The failure of the Jewish government to protect Jewish lives by doing all that is necessary by taking any and every step against the Arabs is criminal. And the outcry by that same government (along with, of course, the left-liberal axis) at the slightest Jewish reaction against Arabs is grotesque.

No government, including the Israeli one, has any right to protest when-because of its failure to carry out its elementary duty to protect its citizens-individual Jews, who fear for their lives and future, rise up and act in self-defense. The only legitimate right of any government, including that of Israel, to rule over people, is based on its obligation to give those people protection. When the obligation is breached, citizens can question whether they owe allegiance to what to them has become an illegitimate authority. The truth is that many Israelis, frustrated, bitter, fearful for their existence, would welcome another David Raziell who would speak to the Ishmaelites-descended from the one the Torah spoke of as "he will be a wild man, his hand against all and all against him"-the only language they understand. Terrorists and cruel barbarians understand two things: Terror and cruelty. Of this did the Rabbis speak when they said: "He who has mercy on the cruel is destined to be cruel unto the merciful." Another Raziell who would teach the Arab the lesson of Jewish might, would be condemned by all the Hellenists

of Authority and eventually, be honored as a national hero.

Madness once confronted and challenged, may grow even madder, but the situation can never return to what it once was. The Irgun, now under a new leader, Menachem Begin, (Raziel was killed in Iraq while serving under the British army in World War II as the Irgun arranged a temporary truce), once again broke with the havlaga line of the yishuv. This time in a war against the British. Perfidious, treacherous Albion, through a White Paper that barred more than a relative handful to come to the land, was the primary reason that Jews fleeing Hitler's Germany could not find haven in the one land that was theirs. Hundreds of thousands who might have been saved, perished because of the British.

The Irgun now declared war on the British, to the anger and dismay of the official Jewish establishment. But the fundamental fact remained; the British, in the midst of the Holocaust, were turning away Jewish boats filled with desperate Jews fleeing Hitler.

One ship, carrying 800 Rumanian Jews who had barely escaped the German occupation of the country, was ordered to head back to sea. It sank in the Mediterranean, taking with it every Jew. The man responsible for executing British policy-and Jews-was Lord Moyne, an Irishman who betrayed his own country as he was instrumental in the oppression of the Irish revolutionaries seeking independence for Eire. When implored by Jews to allow the millions of their brethren who had an opportunity to escape the Holocaust to enter the land of Israel, Moyne barked: "What am I going to do with a million Jews?" Another anti-Zionist joined the ranks. But this time, there was a different Jewish response.

On November 6, 1944 in the hot Cairo afternoon, Lord Moyne returned in a small military automobile from his office to his elegant home in the wealthy Zamalek neighborhood. Two men approached the car. Two bullets ripped into the man who had worked so diligently to keep one million Jews from living. Police pursued the two and they were captured, but for Lord Moyne it made no difference. He was dead and the shock that rocked the British Empire was compounded when it was discovered that the two young men were Jewish soldiers, members of the National Liberation Movement known as the Fighters for the Freedom of Israel (the Sternists).

The FFI was a small group founded as an offshoot of the Irgun Zvai Leumi when its leader, Abraham Stern, refused to end the battle against the British even though World War II had begun. Stern was a rare individual. Deeply religious, a brilliant writer and poet, he was the author of the FFI hymn, Unknown Soldiers:"

Unknown soldiers, we are here without uniform,

and all about is terror and the shadow of death...

Stern was the object of a massive manhunt by the British who found him in a house in Tel-Aviv and shot him in the back as they led him down the stairs. But his disciples continued the struggle, as they softly sang the hymn:

"Our wish is to live forever as free men,

our dream is to die for our homeland..."

Of such stock came the two young killers of Lord Moyne, Eliyahu Hakim and Eliyahu Beit-Tzouri. The British were determined that the two should die, and as they ruled Egypt, they ordered that the defendants be tried before a military tribunal. The outcome was predictable and at 8 AM on Thursday March 22, 1945, the two young heroes were hanged. Not a Jew was allowed to be present, but if the British believed that the murder of the two Zionists would quell the revolt, they were gravely mistaken. In three years, their rule in the Land of Israel would be over, broken by such Jews as those who avenged the deaths of their brothers and sisters.

But the official Jewish establishment was not concerned with that. In fury and hate that verged on madness, the Jewish leaders of the yishuv moved to physically crush the porshim, the dissidents. What obsessed them was one thing-the threat to their authority. As early as September, 1937, the man who was head of the Political Department of the Jewish Agency (and who was to become Israel's first Foreign Minister) Moshe Shertok (Sharett), sent a telegram to Prof Z. Brodetsky of the Jewish Agency Executive in London. In it he declared that he was "troubled seriously at the continuation of the acts of reaction on the part of Jews." He stated that he had suggested to the British High Commissioner(!) "to draft several hundred special police from Jerusalem, Tel Aviv and Haifa to keep street discipline." Outrageous. But all too typical. All too familiar.

Indeed, in a public speech at Gan Rina in Tel Aviv (September 3, 1937), Shertok (Sharett) threatened civil war against the Jews of the Irgun: "Let it be said openly that if we do not reach a unified discipline and unified responsibility in response to the abominable murders-there will be a (civil) war in the yishuv." In commenting on the speech and the threat to fight fellow Jews a writer for the Labor Union paper Davar, one Y. ben Dor, wrote:

"Shertok announced publicly that the yishuv will not allow a game of blood in its midst... The yishuv will fight it and the Revisionists (Jabotinsky's party) know that this is so, and the yishuv will not accept the yoke of hooligans and robbers and national Sikriites (the anarchistic group of the days of the Second Temple)..."

And one of the Haganah leaders, Eliyah Golomb, declared at a special meeting of the Jewish leaders of the yishuv (September 5, 1937): "There is no place here for a soft reply; we need iron action against the (Jewish) terror." And Shertok (Sharett) at the same meeting stated: "We all know that those responsible for the latest actions is a separate organization... a small group, that has no awe of the organized powers of the yishuv and does not accept its discipline; there will always be a permanent danger tied to it."

How nothing changes. Even when the oppressor establishment of today is composed of the men that yesterday's authorities attempted to crush. But more of that later.

Now, in 1944, after the killing of Lord Moyne by the "dissidents the leader of the Jewish authority of the yishuv, David Ben Gurion, went livid with fury. In a speech before the Histadrut Conference (November 22, 1944), a speech that oddly enough is not to be found in his collective orations, Ben Gurion declared war on Jews; Members of and sympathizers with the "dissidents" were to be driven from their places of employment and even from schools. More, they were to be apprehended by Jews and handed over to the British. For the Jews of the Eretz Yisrael, said the leader of the Jewish community, there was "common interest with the British." Obscene? A word hardly powerful enough. Here are excerpts of the speech:

"The time for action has arrived," spoke Ben Gurion. "words have no influence-they are blank bullets. We have decided to vomit them out of our midst. Let these words vomit them out of our midst, not be empty phrases. The terrorists are not influenced by phrases... The gangs are now waiting what will come out of this convention. The demand to vomit them out of our midst must be translated into a language of deeds by every one of us... We must suppress in our hearts every personal feeling-let them not preach piety to us, Let every boy and girl be taught by our Youth Organizations that if the Gangs come asking money of their fathers and mothers, he or she (the children) must immediately notify the proper authority And if they don't know any other address, et them go to the [British] Police."

The speech continues:

"Since the British government and Police are intent on exterminating the terror, we are collaborating with them-to that extent... Without helping the British government

and without its help we shall not uproot this contagious disease, I repudiate the kindness which was justified in other times. In our circumstances this is a twisted kindness, a kindness of fools... There is no neutrality between us and terrorism. Either terrorist gangs or an organized Jewry-there is no escape from the alternative."

Ben-Gurion backed up his fiery address by sending out special Haganah units to kidnap Irgunists. The special "Shock Troops" of the Haganah, the Palmach, kidnapped, beat, tortured Jews. The Haganah forcibly extorted information from some of their Jewish captives and handed the others over directly to the British. Ben-Gurion's men also supplied the British with the names of hundreds of other Irgun fighters, and tipped off the British to the secret hiding places of the Irgun's hard-won stores of weapons. The Haganah called these operations "The Season," the hunting season. Obscene? No; worse, far worse.

Indeed, the Jews of Eretz Yisrael have a long record of defying the official leadership when the lives and security of Jews have been at stake. And the leaders of the Jewish community in the land of Israel, the authority, from the days of the British mandate and into the creation of the state itself, have a long record of crushing Jews who sought to fight the enemy, in spite of the Jewish leadership. They have deliberately murdered Jews.

Democracy in Israel? Political freedom? Hardly. Say, rather, power. And the obsession with power; a determination to cleave unto power-at any cost. And because of this, they will never readily allow any real, fundamental change that will threaten the source of that power. They will never allow any basic change in the system that allows them to control power, wealth, the state. They will crush any really meaningful different opposition that threatens to sweep away their built-in feudal privileges.

Hardly any of the Zionist leaders came from a democratic country. They were overwhelmingly products of an Eastern Europe with its totalitarian culture and concepts. They were overwhelmingly socialists or Jews of the bureaucratic, authoritarian mind. They might spout paeans to "the people," but, at best, it was they who would decide what was "best" for those people. From the earliest days, the key to everything was power.

That is why elections in Israel from the beginning were rife with coercion and fraud. Jews in moshavim (agricultural settlements), traditionally Sephardic, newly arrived in the land and politically naive, were warned that the "favors" of the state were dependent on the results of the voting in the settlement. Arabs were cynically used, as bribes were handed to the mukhtars, the village chiefs, and the heads of the hamullas, the clans, to bring the entire village or clan into the "correct" voting columns. The deliberate use of paper ballots made it much easier to cheat. And, indeed, the State Comptroller of Israel made a biting attack on the very process of elections in May, 1989, declaring that the results of the elections for the Twelfth Knesset (November, 1988) as published by the Ministry of Interior and the Central Elections Committee, "do not reflect the results in practice."

In the words of the Hebrew language newspaper, Yisrael Shelanu, "Thus practically speaking, the Comptroller has ruled that the results of the elections for the Knesset were fraudulent. She specifies a long list of irregularities in the voting that cast a heavy shadow on the legality of the latest elections to Knesset."

Power. That is what always obsessed them and that is what obsesses them today both labor and Likud. Not "democracy" and not "law" and not "justice" but power. Their power. And in order to keep that power, they are not above killing Jews.

They murdered a religious Jew, Jacob De Haan in 1934, because he was an anti-Zionist. Indeed, the leaders of the group that ordered the murder were Yitzhak ben Zvi, later to be the President of Israel, and his wife, a famous poetess-both of the hierarchy of the Labor movement. They murdered a 17-year-old youth, named Yedidya Segal on suspicion of belonging to the Irgun. He

was tortured by a Haganah kidnap gang and died. The Mayor of Jerusalem Teddy Kollek was a key figure in the kidnapping and torturing of Irgun members and supporters.

Worst, the most horrifying of the examples, is the deliberate blowing up of the Irgun ship, Altalena, off the beach of Tel Aviv in June, 1948, along with the murder of 16 Jews who were aboard.

It was a terrible time for the fledgling Jewish State, established barely a month earlier. The armies of Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Iraq had invaded the country. A severe defeat, with heavy casualties had been suffered by the new Israeli army at Latrun. In the center of the country Egyptian troops were now only 20 miles from Ashdod, on the road to Tel Aviv. The Etzion bloc had fallen to the Jordanian forces and Arab troops were at the southern end of Jerusalem, with the Old City already in their hands. The most serious problem of all was the overwhelming superiority of the Arabs in material. They far surpassed the Jews in artillery, armor and planes. Worse Ben Gurion explained the terrible defeat at Latrun by revealing that the entire Jewish force there had only 1,300 rifles (later it was learned that hundreds of newly arrived Jewish immigrants were taken off the ships at Haifa and dispatched to the Latrun front, with only sticks as weapons. They were slaughtered). The very existence of the Jewish State was in the balance and Jewish leaders desperately sought ways to get arms and ammunition.

And suddenly as if some prayer Divinely granted-there it was. A veritable arsenal of ammunition, loaded on the ship, Altalena. The product of years of fund-raising efforts by Irgun supporters in the United States, it carried five thousand Lee-Enfield rifles, one million rounds of ammunition, one thousand grenades, three hundred Bren guns, fifty cannon, four thousand aerial bombs, nine tanks, fifty anti-tank guns, large quantities of medical equipment, as well as 920 trained combat soldiers. The French government agreed to allow the ship to be loaded and to sail for Israel from the port of Marseilles.

Painstaking discussions with the new Israeli government led to an agreement with Ben Gurion that the ship could land. It was agreed that the spot would be Kfar Vitkin, a Labor settlement on the coast. When the ship arrived, however, the authorities suddenly told the Irgun that it would not be allowed to land and it was fired upon from the shore and from two corvettes of the Israeli navy. With Menachem Begin aboard, the Altalena now set off for Tel Aviv where she was grounded opposite Frishman Street. There she was again attacked by heavy fire from the beach and the best account is that of the commander of the Altalena, a U.S. Navy veteran named Monroe Fein:

"The ship continued to receive heavy firing from the shore. For a period of about one and a half hours. Some of the heavy machine-guns ashore were using armour-piercing ammunition which passed right through steel bulkheads of the ship. This fact began to cause numerous casualties. We had no doctor on board and some of our casualties were very seriously wounded. We contacted, through Etzel headquarters ashore, the army commander and requested a cease-fire in order to allow us to remove the wounded men from the ship. We arranged that we would use our own LCVP for this purpose. Cease-fire was agreed to almost at once and all firing on both the shore and ship had stopped within a few minutes. From this point on there was not a single round of ammunition fired from the ship for the remainder of the afternoon.

"Immediately after the cease-fire order we attempted to contact the LCVP which had remained on the beach to the north of the ship. However, we discovered that we were unable to reach them as apparently their radio set had gone dead. Jack Baron, the Chief Officer volunteered to swim to the boat to tell the crew of the arrangement that had been made. As soon as he was in the water, he was fired upon many times from the shore. He succeeded in reaching the shore, only to be captured by army

men. He was not allowed to walk up to the boat. When we saw there was no possibility of communicating with our own boat, we immediately made this Fact known to the Palmach commander and asked that a government boat be sent from the harbor to take off the wounded. This was immediately promised us. We then settled down to wait for the appearance of this boat, meanwhile caring for the wounded as best we could.

"During this time one of them died, One hour and a half later, and after repeated requests there was still no sign of any boat. We had also tried to signal to the two corvettes to make the same request, but they gave no indication that they even saw our signal, At this time, we were suddenly taken under fire by a large gun which was located on the coast to the north of the city. This gun fired three shots all of which passed over the ship and exploded in the water beyond. We immediately got on the radio and asked whether or not the cease-fire still was in effect and if so, what was the reason for the renewed gunfire. A reply was made that the cease-fire order was still in effect and that the gun would be silenced immediately. Following this there was a period of about fifteen minutes in which no more gunshots were made. During this time I conferred with the Commander-in-Chief of the Irgun and told him that if the gunfire should hit the ship, the ship, the cargo and possibly a good many lives would be lost and that he should at all costs maintain the cease-fire order until there could be further negotiations. This he agreed to do but as he himself came up to talk on the radio to the headquarters ashore, the heavy gun resumed firing.

"As soon as the gun started a second time, I struck the flag as a sign of surrender. We again inquired of the Palmach commander whether the cease-fire order was in effect and the reply came that the cease-fire order was In effect but that he had been 'unable to contact all Fronts.' Within a few seconds after this message was received, there was a direct hit on the ship which started a large fire in the cargo hold. The ship's crew made immediate and valiant efforts to put out this fire, but because of the nature of the cargo it proved beyond our capacity and I ordered all men aboard to prepare to abandon the ship.

"The first thought all of us had was to remove the wounded men. There was no panic. Everyone behaved in an extremely calm and heroic manner As the men began jumping off the ship and swimming towards the shore, those of us still on board saw that they were being shot at continuously From rifles and machine-guns on the beach, I rushed to the bridge and began waving a white flag and shouting to stop the fire on the men who were swimming for their lives. At the same time another man hoisted a large piece of white canvas on the halyard, but these efforts were of little avail, as the firing continued."

At least 16 Jews died in the waters of Tel Aviv that day. Jews murdered by other Jews, under orders of the Jewish authority that saw the Irgun as a threat to its power The commander of the forces that murdered the Jews was Yitzhak Rabin, later to become Prime Minister and later yet, Defense Minister during the intifada where he showed far greater concern for "morality" towards Arabs than to the Jews he murdered in 1948.

And the man who gave the order, the Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben Gurion, in discussing the murder of Jews by Jews in the land of Israel, told the provisional State Council (acting Parliament) on June 23, 1948: "Blessed be the cannon that blew up the ship. It should be enshrined in the Third Temple of the Jews."

Appropriate and emblematic of Ben Gurion and of those who were the authority in the State of Israel. Hard, cruel autocrats who used "the people" for their own political ends. When, for example, he was asked to allow the remains of Jabotinsky to be buried in Israel, (he died in

1940 in New York), Ben Gurion stated:

"Israel does not need dead Jews but living Jews, and I see no blessing in multiplying graves in Israel." (Letter to Judge Joseph Lamm of the Tel Aviv District Court, Vice President of the B'nai B'rith in Israel, May 7, 1958)

Appropriate and typical of the authorities of Israel who deliberately set about to spiritually destroy hundreds of thousands of Sephardic Jewish immigrants to Israel from Arab lands.

The Jewish Scarlet Letter is shamefully written on the pages of history. The hundreds of thousands of Jews from Arab lands who poured into Israel, after the state was established in 1948, were the products of two millennia of Judaism, of Jewish law and tradition. Their Zionism was not the product of a gentilized secular na-tionalism that came from such European secular nationalists as Herzl, Weizman, and Ben Gurion. The Zionism of the Jews from Arab lands, was not a negative one based upon fear of anti-Semitism. Theirs was the authentic kind, a positive Zionism that was based not on fear of gentiles but on love of Israel-the land and the G~d. They were not fleeing a holocaust, but pursuing a dream of centuries. They were not coming to a new country. They were returning to Eretz Yisrael, the land of the Jewish people, where they could live as Jews, where they could create a Jewish state with all the traditions and laws of the Judaism they knew and had observed for two thousand years. In the face of the fact that they were coming to a country controlled by cynical secular rejectors of everything that was traditional and Judaistic, hard and ruthless East European collectivists-their naiveté was more than sad.

As the Sephardic Jews flooded into the country by the hundreds of thousands, the terrified leftist political leaders saw in them a distinct political threat to their hegemony whose basis had been laid more than 20 years earlier. Here were religious Jews; na-tionalist Jews; individualistic Jews; Jews who certainly were not prepared to vote for the secular, in some cases atheist and socialist parties that controlled the Jewish community with an iron political grip. Every logical sign pointed to their voting for religious parties or the nationalist one, Herut, the new party of Menachem Begin that sprang from the Irgun. Something had to be done in order to keep power. And in the manner of any political ward boss or Mafia group something was done. Something drastic. Something shameful. Something outrageous. Something that can only be called a Holocaust. Not a physical one, but a spiritual one. And not committed by gentiles, but by Jews.

The Jewish authority in Israel determined that everything possible had to be done not only to coerce, force, and pressure the Sephardic Jews into voting for it but, more important, to totally destroy their spiritual life.

As the new immigrants arrived, they were placed in transit camps that were effectively locked, and placed off limits to religious and nationalist representatives. Immigrants who sought employment or housing were told to register their children in secular schools, not religious ones. The children-all of whom were religious-were now told by teachers or youth leaders at the secular Youth Aliya institutions and schools or the left-wing kibbutzim to which they were sent, that 'religion was needed in the Exile but not here' or worse, that their parents were "backward." Yemenite children, brought to the country through Youth Aliya without their parents, were mentally and physically coerced into shaving their earlocks, which, for the Yemenite male was the very outward sign of the Jew. Indeed, the earlocks were called simanim, or signs-the sign of a Jew in Yemen.

The children were given non-kosher food to eat; they were placed in situations in which they had to violate the Sabbath. The young children could not stand up to the pressure and they broke. Two thousand years of Judaism that had stood firm in the face of the gentile Exile could not stand up to the Jewish destroyers of Judaism in the State of Israel.

The new immigrants were loaded into trucks and, taken to agricultural settlements (Moshavim)

which were controlled by the Authority Promises of credit, feed, a new factory markets, were conditioned on the moshav voting the "right" way. Immigrants who were not members of the leftist octopus conglomerate, Histadrut (that was at one and the same time a union, owner of countless factories, marketer, political entity, and in general controller of almost every phase of life of the country), simply did not get jobs.

And the brutally arrogant authority went further-a step that was not only criminal but obscenely racist. In the early years of the state, hundreds of Yemenite babies disappeared, immediately after birth. Doctors or nurses would inform the mother that the baby had 'died.' A demand to see the body was always met with inexplicable and confusing replies. A demand to see the grave was similarly met with a stonewall of refusal. For some 40 years, the Yemenite Jewish community in Israel has demanded an impartial committee of inquiry to get to the bottom of the disappearances. They have never been granted one. The charges by the Yemenites that the babies never died and that they were stolen and given away for adoption to members of the ruling elite who did not have children, have never been refuted. Indeed, the obstinate failure to show the graves or to establish a committee of inquiry, only adds to the deep suspicions.

And, in these days, when the demagogues of the Jewish authority paint every opponent with the brush of racism," the ques-tion to be asked is: If those simple mothers whose babies were stolen from them had been Europeans, rather than Yemenites, would anyone have dared to steal their babies?

Democracy? Rule of Law? The waving high of these banners by the ruling authority in Israel is a bad joke. For them, "democracy" is a word to be "used," as they use people. It is more than a sham. It is a scam, and a clever one at that. Only those who have lived in real democracies can appreciate the emptiness of the "democracy" of the authority in Israel. Only those who have run afoul of the enmity of the Authority in Israel, can appreciate the truly total-itarian nature of the regime.

And this is why in challenging the government, let none feel guilt when the authoritarians shout that they threaten "democracy".

Chapter 12: Democracy

Democracy in the present State of Israel? Hardly.

In the Summer of 1976 I was invited to the police station in Tel Aviv. Since the invitation was in the form of three plainclothes men who arrived to take me there, it seemed prudent to comply. Arriving at the station, located on Dizengoff Street, I was ushered into a third floor room, whose door was totally devoid of any identifying sign. A rather balding man sat at a desk and he introduced himself as "Brenner." It was glaringly clear that this was the local office of the Shin Bet, the General Secret Services, whose legendary James Bond deeds never include their exploits against Jews.

'Brenner' proceeded without delay to inform me that he was unhappy over my activities and told me directly:

"We do not warn more than once and this is the second time that I am telling you to stop it." (A message to that effect had been delivered to me by the Shin Bet some months earlier, through my brother).

I considered it prudent not to point out the essential contradiction in what he had said but, instead, asked:

"Stop what? Exactly what would you like me to stop? Breathing?"

"Brenner" was not amused. Indeed, Brenners are never amused, lacking that sense of humor which is the major demarcation line between normal people and the totalitarian mind.

"I am not here to argue with you, he said. If you do not stop, you will regret it." That ended the interview and, needless to say I did not "stop it," whatever "it" was, and continued with my ideological struggle. And so, it happened that on the night after the Fast of the 17th of Tamuz, 1976, I found myself walking slowly and leisurely on Rechov Chana (Chana Street), a small, poorly lit street in Shikun Chabad area in Jerusalem, located between Sanhedria and Ezrat Torah neighborhoods. I was returning from giving a class to a group of Jewish Defense League leaders who had arrived in the country for an eight-week leadership training course. It was close to 11 PM and the s~ree1 was empty of passersby as I walked home.

And then I heard it. The merest of sounds behind me, but hearing it undoubtedly saved my life. I began to turn to see what had made the noise and, there, just beginning its descent was a sack. A burlap sack being brought down over my head, instinctively I threw myself down on the ground, the gutter, and began shouting loudly: "Mechablīm! Mechablīm!" (Terrorists! Terrorists!) The assailants (there were two, as I saw later) were professional and methodical. Foiled in their efforts to get me in the burlap sack they attempted to hit me with what were apparently blackjacks, heavy metallic weapons. I began, and continued, to roll over and over, all the time shouting, and they had great difficulty aiming at me though they were eventually able to fracture a hand and cause a deep gash in my head.

Had Divine Providence not caused me to hear that slight sound and see the sack, I would have been caught in it and surely killed.

By this time, people began to come out of their houses in response to the noises and an automobile suddenly rounded the corner, coming toward us. The attackers fled, and I could clearly see that there were two of them. They had not made a sound during the entire assault, a thing that clearly ruled out robbers or muggers. They were "Brenner's" men, the Shin Bet carrying out its threat, the Shin Bet of the Jewish State against a Jew.

In the years that followed many were the stories I heard about the methods used by the Israeli General Secret Services. Jews accused of being "right-wing extremists" and who were alleged to have attacked or planned to attack Arabs, were held in tiny cells where they could not lie down and without blankets against the bitter cold. They were awakened again and again, and interrogated, sometimes with plastic sacks put over their faces. Charges, patently false, were fabricated and witnesses simply lied. Promises were made that were broken and, in general, the worst of James Bond western culture was used.

Two points:

I have not the slightest objection to any method used against enemies of the Jewish people who wish to destroy us. I find it intolerably obscene, however that such methods be used against Jews who are not the enemies of the State of Israel. Nothing could more graphically underline the gentilization of the Jewish State than to see who the Shin Bet people are and how their callousness to fellow Jews emerges from their total lack of Jewishness of soul.

Secondly, I say all this because there is no commandment to be silent when Jews suffer at the hands of other Jews. There is no ahavat Yisrael, love of Jews, in silence concerning evil done by Jews to their fellow Jews. Indeed, true love of Jews, demands that our voice cry out loudly against the injustice being done to Jews inside Israel.

Consider, for example, the outrageous, totalitarian treatment meted out to two young Yeshiva students arrested on the Temple Mount on May 27, 1989. The Mount, victim itself of a massive desecration by the gentilized leaders of the state, finds Jews barred from praying there or exercising their G-d given right of freedom of religion on their holiest site on this earth.

The two young men, David Axelrod and Benzion Gapstein, were attacked by the gang of Moslems that is hired by the infamous Wakf, the Moslem Religious Council, headed by the Mufti (and no greater band of Jew-haters can be found on this earth). They fought back, injuring several Moslems, when the Israeli police, Arabs, attacked them, too. (Most of the police in the Old City of Jerusalem are Arabs, another desecration of G~d's Name, another disgrace and outrage.) The Arab police attacked the young men with clubs and the Jews fought back. They were arrested, charged with attacking police "under serious circumstances" (sic) and held for months without bail.

In what civilized western state is no bail allowed for two young men with no criminal record and on such a relatively minor charge? The purpose of bail is not to punish the accused (the accused is innocent until proven guilty) but merely to insure his appearance at trial. In Israel, the refusal to allow bail (and how often did that happen to me!) has a specific purpose. Punishment.

The defendants may be found innocent, but will have lost months of their lives. This is a common thing in the country.

As is the outrageous court habit of deciding to keep a suspect in jail because he refuses to "cooperate" with the police, meaning he exercises his right to remain silent! Consider, for example, the case of Meir Berg and Uriel Bigun, two young settlers who were attacked by Arabs in Sarnaria, and who were "suspected" of having fired and killed an Arab.

Israel has deliberately kept many infamous, colonialist British Mandatory laws, that, among the rest, allow detention for 48 hours without need to show cause. The state, of course, does not have habeas corpus. Invariably the police then ask a judge to remand the suspect for up to 15 more days; fifteen days at a time, until they decide to present an indictment, at which time they ask that the suspect be held until the end of his trial. Again, the use of remand to punish one who is merely a suspect, a person who, in any truly democratic state, would be considered innocent until proven guilty.

In the case of the above-mentioned two settlers, on June 29, 1989, the police asked for a remand of 15 more days. The judge, in granting a remand of only ten days (clearly an indication of her doubts), then justified the decision to keep the suspects in jail in truly Orwellian fashion. I quote from the newspaper Ha'Aretz (June 30, 1989):

"She noted that by the fact that the suspects refuse to cooperate (sic), they strengthen the police version."

Shades of 1984! A suspect has a basic right to remain silent and nothing can be inferred from that. Indeed, the interrogator informs the suspect of that right before beginning the interrogation. And then, the suspect having been told that he need not say anything, that he need not "cooperate," a judge says that the implementation by a citizen of his basic right "strengthens the police version" that he is guilty!

Or the outrageous habit of the police (used against me several times) under which, at the arraignment, the police officer tells the judge that the evidence is "secret" and cannot be shown to the prisoner or his attorney for "security reasons." Not only do the defendant and his attorney have not the slightest clue as to what the police are talking about and what evidence there is against the suspect, but time after time, the "secret" evidence consists of a note from a police officer to a colleague stating, "we have good reasons to believe that "X" is guilty of a serious attempt to..." Of course, this is nonsense, but the judge, especially when the officer in charge is from the Shin Bet (the Secret Services) or the Department of Special Services, is both unsure and impressed by the apparent seriousness of the note.

What invariably happens is that the judge decides to "compromise" and agrees to the remand but at a lesser term than the Authority asked. Injustice is thus "limited." The suspect who

should be free is not remanded for 15 days, but only for eight or ten. Justice...

Or the practice of police asking that no bail be granted because "we have not yet finished investigating the case." The truth is that this is a cynical ploy and in the cases in which it was used against me, proved to be a total fraud. The police never bothered to ask me anything about the case until the last day or so of the remand, at which point they came back to the judge to say that they still had not finished.

Or the practice of not informing a suspect of his "crime," of course, reaches it zenith in the concept of "administrative arrest" under which a defendant is sent to prison for six months without benefit of a trial or even knowing what the charge is. After the six months are over, the Minister of Defense can sign yet another order for yet another six months, ad infinitum.

In 1980, on the eve of Jerusalem Day four plainclothesmen came to my home at 9:30 in the evening and showed me a paper, signed by the Minister of Defense. It was an Administrative Order sending me to prison for six months. When I asked what the charge was, I was told that under the decree I was not allowed to know. To this day, I do not know what the charge was though I do know that there was nothing of substance to the entire farce. I sat in Ramle prison for approximately eight months, tasting the justice of Israeli "democracy," first hand.

The world understands the opposed concepts of democracy and totalitarianism. In most cases, the two are easily distinguishable and we have little difficulty in pointing out to which of the two systems a particular country belongs. But Israel has succeeded in creating a system of Demotarianism, a totalitarian regime cloaked in much of the trappings of democracy. To the outside world it is a democracy but to those who run afoul of its inner system-and especially if they are particular thorns in the side of the govern-ment-the totalitarian nature is clear.

Israel. Neither the Jewish state we dreamed of nor even a democracy. I sit here, a citizen, and look at it, seeing the face of Demotarianism.

Democracy in Israel? Rule of law? Political freedom? Hardly. They are concepts to be bandied about and used in order to consolidate power and crush meaningful opposition. But the real word is Power. That is what obsesses them, those who are the authority in Israel, both Labor and Likud. Not democracy and not freedom and not justice and not law. Power. Their power.

And this is why those who never cease to bow before the altar of "democracy" thought nothing of trampling on it when they decided, in 1988, to ban a legal Party from running for election, a party that they well understood, posed a fundamental threat to their very power, to the very present system, to the very power of the Authority that had held power for so long in Israel.

On October 18, 1988, democracy received a mortal wound in Israel and a precedent was decreed that opened the door to the formal death of democracy in the Jewish State. On that day the High Court of Israel upheld a Knesset Central Elections Committee ban on the Kach Movement's running in the Knesset elections. Had it been a pornographic movie, every civil libertarian organization would have come to its defense. Had a movie or play been banned on the grounds that it was dangerous to the morals of society, liberal Jewish groups and temples and rabbis would have climbed the ramparts of "freedom of speech" and "expression," demanding that freedom ring even for pornography. Had a radical opposition group with ties to guerilla movements been stricken from the ballot in El Salvador, there would have been long and loud protests on the part of liberal Jews, clergy and lay.

But when the State of Israel, long boasted of as the only democracy in the Middle East, bluntly decides that a political party that is already sitting in the Knesset and according to the polls will receive anywhere from 6-12 seats, shall not run-the silence from Jewish liberals is deafening. That is the reality of the Israeli ban-ning of the Kach Movement.

It would, of course, be tempting to say that the trampling of democracy on the part of its Israeli apostles and the consequent silence of the American Jewish liberals is the ultimate victory for Kach. And that is, of course, true, in the sense that nothing could have more underlined the hypocrisy of Israeli and American Jewish Establishment "liberal and democratic" values. But we cannot stop with that.

When the Supreme Court of Israel joined the Knesset in barring the people of Israel from exercising their right to vote or not to vote for Kahane, they destroyed democracy and legitimized anarchy. No government dare tell people to whom it has barred the choice of representatives that they must accept being limited to the choice of those parties that the government finds acceptable.

The decision to de-legitimize Kach has legitimized anarchy and revolution. It is not I who call for it, it is the logic and inexorable force of the act itself. A frightened and desperate people that has not been allowed its democratic choice may take matters into its own hands-in order to save itself and its children. That is what the Knesset and Supreme Court of Israel have decreed for the Jewish State.

The fact that since the inception of the Jewish State, democracy, as known in the western world, has not really existed in Israel, does not mitigate the seriousness of the High Court move nor does it change the fact that fundamental substantive change took place in the assault on democracy. Whereas until now, various Israeli authorities were able to manipulate democracy quietly and far from the harsh light of day this time they were compelled-because of fear of Kach's potential power-to brutally stab political freedom on the stage for all to see. For the first time there was a formal political homicide in Israel. The story of this formal rape-murder of democracy in the Jewish State really began in July, 1984, when, in a result that stunned the entire range of Israeli political life, the Kach Movement won a seat in the Knesset. The news even overshadowed the question of which of the major parties had won more seats. The fact that Kach, with a budget that was worse than a joke, condemned by every facet of Israeli political and intellectual life, and which had lost three previous elections was able to win a seat in Parliament, was a shock to the Israeli Establishment.

And here, the reality of Israel's democracy and political freedom" came into being.

Looking back on the events since Kach was elected to the Knesset in 1984, one is overwhelmed by the sheer hate and trampling of basic rights. One is stunned by the bile-the defamation, the lies, the twisted faces and facts. And, of course, all from people who pride themselves on their culture, fair play democratic tolerance and intellectual ability to discuss any and all issues scientifically, calmly, rationally Their hatred was a poisonous, noxious thing. Their totalitarianism was mind-boggling.

Israel government television and radio ruled that Meir Kahane, a Knesset member whom they utterly opposed, be therefore, not permitted to appear on programs; not to have his statements reported; not to have his press conferences covered. Yellow journalism and blatant, deliberate lies abounded, all with intent to smear and defame.

The Ministry of Education rules that Meir Kahane, a Knesset member, not be allowed to address students, though Arabs and Communists spoke freely in the public high schools of the state. A similar policy was announced by the universities of Israel, where pro-PLO students and speakers came and went freely but not an elected member of the Knesset. The high schools introduced a compulsory course on "Kahanism," which not only was filled with falsehoods, fraud and bile, but was a blatant political brainwashing course that smacked of the totalitarian systems of fascism and communism.

The armed forces, whose neutrality and non-political status must be assured in order to unify rather than drive yet another wedge in the fabric of the people, originated a campaign of hate

and defamation against Meir Kahane, a Knesset member, forcing soldiers to attend lectures by leftists that dripped hatred and poi-sonous venom. The official army radio devoted an entire day to a non-stop attack on Meir Kahane, a Knesset member, including the damning of his "crime-seeking to have Jewish law obeyed in the Jewish State.

The Knesset rules were changed more in the space of a year than in the previous 36 of the State, all in order to limit, as much as possible, Meir Kahane, a Knesset member, from exercising his right to speak and to propose legislation.

The Knesset Speaker took upon himself the right to ban any proposed bill that he considered to be racist." He was the one who decided what was "racist" and was responsible to no one to explain on what basis he had so decided or who gave anyone a right to decide what a democratically elected Knesset member could propose or not. It was no surprise therefore, that when I presented a bill that (unknown to the Speaker) quoted the great Jewish codifier Maimonides, word for word, he banned that, too, on the grounds of "racism..."

Knesset members walked out as Meir Kahane, a Knesset member, rose to speak, thus justifying the walkout by Arabs, Communists, and Third World States on Israeli speakers in the U.N. whom they consider to be racists because they are Zionists.

The Parliamentary right of Meir Kahane, a Knesset member, to travel freely throughout the country was limited by a Knesset vote, the first time this had ever happened. My right to send mail from the Knesset free of postage was stripped away-another first.

The President of Israel welcomed in his residence Communists and pro-PLO Arab MKs and refused to do the same for Meir Kahane, a Jewish Zionist Knesset member. A Prime Minister of Israel said that he does not consider Knesset member Meir Kahane to be part of the Jewish people, thus opening the doors to a host of religious Jews to offer similar exit visas to other Jews.

There was more-more "democracy."

Blue-shirted uniformed leftist youths, members of political youth movements, faces twisted in unbelievable ugliness, mouths cursing, arms making obscene gestures even as they threw eggs. and rocks at other Jews who backed Kach, showed up in every city.

A week of incitement by Knesset members and the Israel Army station called on Jews to come to the city of Givatayim to physically prevent a legal rally of Kach. The Mayor of Givatayim had declared earlier: "Kill them while they are small!" And they came by the thousands, mostly members of the kibbutzim, the leftist communal settlements. Hundreds of buses, thousands of people. They came armed. Armed with a hatred that captured their faces, a hatred that one could touch! Worse-smell. And they came with rocks and with metal bars. They came in their humanism and their haired of violence-to hate and to smash.

As my car drove towards the platform it was surrounded by hundreds of them, cursing, shouting, pounding on the windows, attempting to turn the car over. And then a huge rock smashed the front windshield as the crowd went wild with anticipation. It was only the frantic intervention of the police and Border Patrol that saved four Jews from being lynched by the apostles of tolerance and coexistence.

And the next day the newspaper Al Ha'mishmar organ of the Mapam Marxist Party carried a gloating article under the heading: "How sweet to see a violent Left..." And it added: "It was a sight to gladden the soul to see the leaders of Hashomer Ha'tzair and Hanoar Ha'oved [two leftist youth groups] and just ordinary citizens, upholders of law and order, angrily throwing eggs and stones and brandishing clubs."

The question must be asked concerning this psychopathic behavior of both Israeli and American Jews: Why? What is it that so obsesses and drives the Jewish leaders in unprecedented hatred and passionate spleen? What is this hatred and fear?

For clearly that is what is at the bottom of this irrational venom. Fear. Fear of what Kach says. Fear of the ideas that threaten the very intellectual stability and faculty of Jews who have persuaded themselves that Judaism and the foreign, gentilized concepts to which they, daily pay homage, are one and the same. And then along comes Kach, and cries: No, the Jewish Emperors are naked. No, there is a basic, immutable contradiction between Judaism and some of the most sacred, western values-western democracy, political equality, integration, freedom of choice. No more painful nerve could be touched; no greater intellectual torture brought to bear. Kach is a thing more dangerous to the gentilized Jewish leaders than any Arab group, than any militant anti-Jewish one. For Kach has effectively declared war on the falsehood and fraud that are the very basis of the stability of soul of the intellectually assimilated Jewish Establishment leaders. That is the deepest psychological reason why they have declared war on Kach, and why they will stop at nothing, no viciousness and low blow, to destroy it.

But there is much more fundamental, animal crudity that lies at the immediate, practical level of the decision and determination to eliminate Kach, and that is the obsession and lust to cleave unto power. Power.

It is this that led to the climax of the abomination-the outrageous decision by the Knesset of Israel-endorsed by its Supreme Court-to simply ban Kach from running for election. Of course, this was due to the real fear of the Jewish Establishment in Israel of Kach's growing strength, particularly with the youth-a whole generation of new voters-and the Sephardic Jews who constitute a majority of Israeli Jews. Private polls showed Kach with up to 10-12 seats, a thing that sent fear down the spines of the political mafia that has run Israel in one form or another since its inception.

The headline over the weekly poll results of the newspaper Hadashot read: "And who received 13.6% in Ramat Gan?" Followers of the weekly results could have guessed the answer from the clearly despondent tone of the headline. The answer was, of course, the Kach Movement and the newspaper began its commentary with "Kach is third in Ramat Gan, too."

It was only the latest in a series of terrifying (for the Left and Right) polls taken since June 24th by the leftist newspaper that decided to gauge voters preferences differently from all the others. The accepted way has always been to conduct classic polls by asking people for whom they intended to vote. Both the fact that these polls had proven badly wrong in the last three elections (1977, 1981, 1984) as well as the clear feeling that these polls that were showing the Left and Right evenly matched, simply did not coincide with the obvious temper of the people--hawkish-led the editors to poll the electorate in a different way. They decided to place each week, in a different city actual ballot boxes and have people really "vote". For Kach, the traditional polls had always been seen as a joke, as they persisted in giving the controversial group three seats (sic), at the most, a thing that anyone who ever attended as little as two of Kach's nightly rallies (over the last four years) could easily see was ludicrous.

The Hadashot people sensed that, too, and correctly understood that people who intended to vote Kach were not prepared to admit it to some strange poll-taker. Thus, the decision to have a ballot box where people could privately give vent to their real intentions.

And so, there began the polls that can only be described as "terrifying" for the parties of both Left and Right. Two-and-a-half months of polls showed the Kach Movement to be the solid third largest party among the voters, and this fact made the drive to ban Kahane and Kach more hysterical than ever before.

It began back on June 24th when Hadashot published two weeks of voting in three places in Tel

Aviv. This is how the paper began its commentary then: "The public's taste that was most emphasized in the last two weeks was for Kach and Kahane. Wherever you went and with any ballot box that was placed, he competes for the fourth spot, and going up." What stunned the leftist paper was the fact that two of the Tel Aviv areas where the ballot boxes had been placed were areas of left-liberal Israelis, The Fair Grounds and Dizengoff Center. Despite this, Kach had received 6.1% in the former (almost 8 seats) and 5.7% (seven seats) in Dizengoff Center, one of the last places one in Israel would dream of such support for Kahane. The third ballot area may have said more than any other, however. The paper had placed its box at the Yad Eliyahu area where soldiers waited to be taken to their bases. There, Kach received a stunning 19.1% of the vote, just 1.1% behind the leader, Likud!

The next week only added to the consternation as the ballot box in the central bus station in Netanya gave Kach 10.8% (nearly 13 seats) and placed them third, behind Likud and Labor. The stunned paper wrote that if the Arab attacks did not stop, "Kach and Kahane will put a division into the Knesset." But the Kach band played on.

On July 8th, it was Jerusalem's turn and the ballot box in the center of town gave Kach 11.2% of the vote, again third place, but this time only three percentage points behind Labor! On to Afula. In that Jezreel Valley city, 9.2% gave Kach their votes and the Hadashot story began: "The results begin to repeat themselves. Kahane grabbed the fourth spot, this time in the central bus station in Afula... The results of the last five ballot boxes show Kahane in the third place."

The July 22nd results came from two cities, Bat Yam and the Labor stronghold, Holon. In Bat Yam, Kach again came in third, with 10.3% of the vote and in Holon, where organized leftists have always attempted to break up Kach rallies, the party received what we believed to be an even more astounding 6.7%. Said the Hadashot writer: "The difference between the results of the poll of Hanoach Smith (a traditional pollster, who now does his polling for Labor) and that of Hadashot worries me not a little. The official Labor pollster claims that Kahane will only get two seats..."

Perhaps because of the summer heat as well as that of the terror of the ballot box, Hadashot set up shop the next week at the shore of the Sea of Galilee. But nothing changed- Kach this time received 8.6%, and one could tell from the tone of the articles that accompanied the voting that a sense of hopelessness was setting in.

On August 5th, the results of voting in Haifa, the once Labor-Left stronghold, were announced, under the headline: "They once called her, Haifa the Red City." Kach was, again, in third place, with 8.8% of the vote and a summary of all the voting until then showed Kach in third place, averaging just under ten percent (9.7%) of the vote or close to twelve seats. The paper could not help a bitter comment concerning the Supreme Court that allowed Kach to run in 1984 and the 119 other Knesset members for allowing "the worm (Kahane) to multiply before their eyes."

The next week, the "worm" had turned even more, and a helpless newspaper could only report that in the center of Beersheba, Kach had come in its usual third, this time with 11.9% or about 14 seats.

And then it was the turn of the bourgeois, stable Ramat Gan and the headline: 'And who received 13.6% in Ramat Gan?' The truth is that the Ramat Gan results so astounded the newspaper that it immediately ran a "control" ballot. Without previous notice, it set up a quick second ballot in the same central square. Nothing changed. Kahane was again third.

One more week remained before the newspaper threw up its hands and discontinued the voting. In a last frantic effort to show up Kach weakness, the paper now set up its ballot box in the bastion of the leftist strength, Givatayim. Givatayim had become a symbol of militant, violent efforts to stop Kahane and Kach. In September, 1985, thousands of leftists, including members

of kibbutzim bused in from all over the country had violently attempted to break up a legal Kach rally.

This was the town that Hadashot was counting upon to show that there were large parts of Israel that totally rejected Kach. And this was the town which, in the Hadashot balloting, gave this "arch racist" no less than 4.2% (six seats), a result far more shocking for the Left than anything in development towns and slum neighborhoods, which are accepted as Kahane fortresses. And so, the pathetic headline in Hadashot: "GIVATAYIM ALSO ABSORBED HIM..."

Hadashot now published its final, overall results: In first place, Likud with 34.4%. In second place Labor with 24.6%. And in third place, Kach, with 101% or a little more than 12 seats.

And a bit of Hadashot commentary went along with the results: "Kahane lies deep in every part of the country. He is the only one of all the smaller parties who retains a stable and strong nucleus in every area of population. In 12 different ballots, over two and a half months of polling, Kahane does not drop below five percent of the voters, no matter where you put the ballot box." Ten weeks of actual ballot "voting".

Ten weeks showed Kach in third place, with 12 seats. That is why those who parrot "democ-racy" and who pay obeisance to it, worshipping at its armpit whenever the issue is the right of the Arabs to vote, have-without a second thought-announced their intention to trample on de-mocracy and to ban a Kach Movement that had powerful support among the electorate. That is why the parties of "democracy" decided to disenfranchise over 200,000 voters. That is the reason for the sheer panic and terror that gripped the Israeli political Establishment, from Left to Right-and, most particularly, Right.

The headline in the August 23, 1988 edition of the Israeli newspaper Hadashot read: "PERES AND SHAMIR WILL WORK TOGETHER TO BAN KAHANE'S LIST."

Nothing could more clearly and openly illustrate the joint effort by Right and Left to kill, at all costs, the phenomenon that was the Kach movement.

In all the years that preceded that headline and in the weeks to follow, the reason given would be Kahane's "racism" and denial of "democracy" More cynical and realistic observers, however, pointed to the main story in Hadashot that appeared the previous day.

In it, a stunned Likud was reported to have commissioned a secret poll that showed Kahane's Kach Movement receiving up to seven seats in the upcoming election. And the Jerusalem weekly Meurav Yerusalmi (August 26) reported on a similar secret Labor Party poll that showed Kahane with eight seats. All this confirmed the stunning series of weekly ballot-box mock-voting results by Hadashot.

The results of all these polls were at such odds with the "official" polls that persisted in showing Kahane's party gaining at most up to three or four seats, that reporters rushed to Kach rallies to ascertain what was happening there. The news media, until then, had simply boycotted Kach.

What they saw confirmed their worst fears. Not only were the crowds large, but also wildly enthusiastic, far different from the programmed and orchestrated ones that appeared at Likud and Labor rallies. Worse, from the points of view of both the hostile news media and the rival parties, it was made up of a disproportionate number of young people, including many teenagers who would vote for the first time or perhaps not yet in the 1988 election, but whose rabid and fervent shouts of KA-HA-NA! and Kahana la'shilton ("Kahane to power") made it clear that an entire generation of new, young voters had made Meir Kahane what Menachem Begin had been for their parents. And no one had forgotten that it was those parents, predominantly from the majority Sephardic communities, who had brought Begin to power.

Suddenly, it began to dawn on the political parties and news media-who had joined together to ban Kahane-that all their efforts of the past four years had gone for naught.

Kach had worked tirelessly for four years, while the other parties had sat back enjoying the perks of power. Almost nightly Kach rallies had been held-two a night-in every part in Israel. There was not a town or village in which I had not appeared at least twice-places in which not one Knesset member had ever shown himself in 40 years. There was not one city in which I had not appeared eight to ten times, in city centers and poor neighborhoods.

Kach's clear message of what to do with the Arabs, and even more, what had been done to the Sephardic Jews by the majority leftist Ashkenazi parties, had received a wildly enthusiastic reception. Now the parties faced the fruits of our efforts and their own contempt for Kach.

And so, the editorial in Israel's largest newspaper, Yediyot Acharonot (August 24) read:

"It is amazing but true, Shamir and Peres agree on one thing: the need to remove the Kach Movement from running for the Knesset. Now, there remains only to see which will take the Initiative in order to make this good and correct intention an actuality."

Israeli democracy was in high gear.

Essentially, the strategy of the ban was based upon implementation of two laws that were passed by the Knesset following the unsuccessful attempt to ban Kach in the 1984 elections for Knesset. At that time, the Knesset Central Elections Committee had indeed voted to ban Kahane's movement, but the High Court ruled that since no law empowered the committee to do such a thing, Kach could not be barred. But already at that point, the Court all but told the Knesset that the passage of such a law would indeed find the justices of Israel prepared to affirm the ban. With hindsight, of course, it appears that a primary reason for the court's leniency vis-à-vis Kach in 1984, stemmed from the fact that no one believed it would even receive one seat, let alone evolve into a power that could hold the balance of power in the formation of the government.

In any event the Knesset hastened to pass an amendment to the Basic Law (paragraph 7a), which declared:

"A list of candidates shall not participate in elections for the Knesset if their goals or actions, directly or indirectly consist of one of the following:

- 1) Negation of the State of Israel as the state of the Jewish people;
- 2) Negation of the democratic character of the state;
- 3) Incitement to racism."

The amendment neither defined "democracy" nor "racism," and was furthermore a confused contradiction that made a mockery of the entire political system. This was to be the cornerstone of the Kach defense, as we shall see later.

The second law, passed more than a year later amid incredible pressure from the Left, defined "racism" as follows:

"Racism: persecution, humiliation, enmity hostility violence or causing dissension between sections of the population, all on the basis of belonging to a particular race, color or national origin." But, following opposition by the religious parties who rightly feared such a definition would easily be used against religious groups, an amendment was made to the amendment that read:

"Publication of a quotation from religious writings or prayer books, or protection of religious ritual shall not be considered racist as long as not done for the purpose of inciting to racism."

Armed with the tools of democratic totalitarianism, the campaign to ban Kach began in earnest. Years earlier, former Attorney General Yitzhak Zamir had declared that "Kahanism" (a noun invented by the liberal-left McCarthyites of Israel) had become synonymous with "racism" (sic). The then Justice Minister Moshe Nissim of the Likud, was the one who led the battle for the aforementioned legislation and not a few wondered what his late father, the former Sephardi Chief Rabbi, would have said.

The hysteria surrounding "Kahanism" led to the ultimate obscenity-the equating of Kahane and his proposals to Nazism and the Nuremberg Laws. Now, with the elections approaching, and the polls shocking, the hounds were off and baying. Asher Wallfish of the dovish, anti-religious Jerusalem Post, wrote an article headed, "WILL KAHANE RUN N NEXT ELECTION?" back on July 22, 1988. The article, blatantly hostile to Kahane, already pronounced the inevitable banning of Kach.

On August 3, the chairman of the anti-religious Center Movement, Amnon Rubinstein, had been the first to formally ask the elections Committee to ban Kahane. The fact that no Knesset list had been offered since the law did not yet allow that, did not deter Rubinstein who, as Minister of Posts, had moved to take away Kahane's right as a Knesset member to send mail from the Knesset free of charge.

Without going into great detail, it is important that one appreciate the sheer brazen contempt for democracy and decency of the Knesset law that gives the Knesset Elections Committee the right to ban a party on the basis of an interpretation of the law, as it sees it.

Consider that carefully. The Knesset Elections Committee is an out-and-out political body composed of all political parties in the Knesset. A political body is given the legal right to ban a competing political group! Democracy at its finest. And political morality too.

The witch-hunt of the liberal-left axis now saw Tom Segev, of the newspaper Ha'Aretz printing a letter from a reader that said, in part:

"In the weeks to come, all the papers will stand before temptation: Kahane will offer to advertise election ads. I implore you to reject the ads despite the monetary temptation. I call upon all the democratic parties to publicly announce that they will not publish ads in papers that accept ads from Kach, just as they will not sit in the Knesset chamber when he rises to speak."

And Segev? The leftist Ha'Aretz wrote:

"It was signed, 'a citizen.' I do not exactly like anonymous letters but the man is right."

Naturally a similar suggestion in regard to one of the pro-PLO Arab parties or the Moscow-puppet Communists would have been met with withering fire by the guardians of free speech.

And then came a secret Likud poll giving Kahane some seven seats. In the words of the newspaper Hadashot (August 22):

"The results were received with shock by the Likud ministers, who were especially surprised by the amount of support for Kahane amidst the young voters."

An emergency meeting of Prime Minister Shamir and his main advisors led to the decision: Do everything to ban Kahane.

Kach and Kahane now became an obsession for the political parties and especially Likud.

Editorials in newspapers, television debates between Kahane-hating Amnon Rubinstein and Aharon Papo (the attorney who would represent Kach before the High Court); radio attacks on Kahane by Dan Meridor of Likud and Chaim Ramon of Labor (they are usually bitter rivals, but on the question of Kahane they be-come bosom friends); newspaper statements by Shamir, Moshe Arens and other Likud leaders swearing that they will not only move heaven and earth to ban Kach but, should the High Court overthrow any such effort, they will never enter into a coalition with Kahane.

The ugly fact was that the Likud of 1988 in its attempts to ban Kach, outdid even Ben Gurion's Mapai and the Leftists, in what they did to Herut and Menachem Begin in the early years of the state. Shamir, Meridor, Arens, Levi et al, led the left into a brazen effort to ban a party that, this time around, would have at least 200,000 citizens who wished to vote for it! It was a classic example of a once-ideological movement, degenerating into a cheap and ugly Israeli version of Tammany Hall.

It was clear as to why Likud joined Labor in banning Kach, when none seemed to be upset at the Communist Party the Marxist Mapam Party the national Arab party of Darawsha, the truly dangerous Ratz Party of Yossi Sand and Shulamit Aloni, groups that are mortal dangers within the body politic. The reason for this was clear: These groups did not threaten Likud and the Right and Kach did. It is a classic lesson in political corruption and the Likud has long since lost any semblance of the hadar (pride), of which it once so proudly boasted.

And so, on Wednesday August 24th, the Likud joins Arnon Rubinstein of the anti-religious, anti-nationalist Center Party and Shimon Peres in asking that the Knesset elections Committee ban Meir Kahane and his Kach Movement. The movers of the motion are three of Shamir's proteges-Roni Milo, Dan Meridor, Ehud Olmert, as well as yarmulka wearing Moshe Nissim of the Liberals, who is not only Minister of Finance but also son of the late Sephardic Chief Rabbi, whose views on the Arabs were at least as firm as those of mine. They are joined by Likud Minister of Justice, Avraham Sharir who, on a tour of the north, tells reporters: "Kahane's place is outside the Knesset." That morning, Laborite Michael Bar Zohar responds to Binyamin Netanyahu's comment of the previous day that "there are 21 Yossi Sarids in Labor," with: "and there are 21 Kahanes in the Likud," which does not, of course, prevent the Likud lynch of Kahane.

Meanwhile, a preview of things that could very well be is given by the pro-PLO Progressive List that asks the committee to ban not only Kach but also Tchiya, Tzomet (of Rafael Eytan and the new Party, Moledet, that speaks of a "voluntary transfer."

Says a Party spokesman: "A racist is a racist whether he is a rabbi born in New York or a Museum Director and a Palmachnick." (The reference is to Moledet's chief, Rehavam Zeevi).

Nothing bothers the Likud whose Pinchas Goldstein congratulates Shimon Peres on joining in the ban on Kach and asks him to include the Progressives, too. By now so many parties are on the "banned" list that the newspaper Yediyot Aharonot carries a cartoon showing picketers demanding: "BAN THE RIGHT! BAN THE LEFT! BAN PLONI! BAN ALMONI! BAN THEM ALL!"

On August 30, Labor officially joins in the demand to ban Kach. Labor MK Chaim Ramon, deputy chairman of the Elections Committee, says that Kahane's speech and bills are clearly racist. He warns of Kach's strength. Kach is not helped by another poll, this one a private one taken by Labor that shows the group taking eight seats.

All this leads to a frenzied campaign in the press calling for my head. The Jerusalem Post's Yosef Goel, a man who has called for intermarriage between Jews and Arabs as a way to solve the problem of war, writes (September 30): There is ample evidence of his [Kahane's] and his

party's racist agitation."

Professor Baruch Bracha, leftist writer on legal affairs for the Kahane-hating newspaper Ha'Aretz, states: "There is no doubt concerning the moral right and legal basis for the banning of Kahane's Party from running in the elections for Knesset." Giora Goldberg, a senior lecturer at the "religious" Bar Han University writes an article titled, "VOMIT AIM OUT" (Hadashot, September 2). In it he declares: "If Kach participates in the elections and wins several seats, there could arise a situation in which Kahane might be considered for the coalition or even the government." Clearly, this is what terrified all of them.

Perhaps the most pathetic party in the drive to lynch Kahane is a group calling itself Lapid, the movement to remember the lessons of the Holocaust, which demands that Kahane be banned so that the Jews can prove that they "learned the lesson of Weimar Germany." That the Arabs would do to the Jews what the Germans did, is apparently lost on the Holocaust "teachers."

Nevertheless, even within the witch-hunt that is Israel, a voice is heard here and there, warning of the consequences of the banning of Kach and Kahane.

Gabriel Stresman writes in Maariv (August 28): "Today a racist platform is banned. Tomorrow the majority will decry a religious one, or an anti-religious one, or who knows what. If we are to ban parties from competing for elections because of ideology, why not ban a party that seeks to have the laws of Torah rule the land? Or the Koran? One should ban a party because of the views of her thinkers by political persuasion, not by legal paragraphs."

United States constitutional and civil right lawyer, Alan Dershowitz, is even firmer. The Harvard Law Professor, in an interview in the Jewish student magazine, Shofar (Autumn, 1988), states flatly:

"Outrageous... I'm appalled that the Association for Civil Rights in Israel is in favor of legislation repressing the speech of Meir Kahane. Once you take away Kahane's freedom of speech, you're liable to take away the speech of Arab advocates on the left and eventually limit the circle of civility to the point where only mainstream people will have a chance to speak and run."

And in the Likud itself second thoughts arise. Not because of the manifest injustice of the Likud decision to ban Kach, but because of the same fear of Kahane that moved Likud leaders to ask to ban him. In the newspaper Yated Ne'eman (September 8), it is reported that a number of Likud leaders fear that rather than gaining votes if Kahane is banned, "if the move to ban Kahane is spearheaded by the Likud representative in the Election Committee, the Kach votes will revenge themselves on Likud and support other parties."

On the other hand, the tiny politicians of Labor find that a group within their party suggests letting Kahane run so that he will take votes away from Likud. Justice, truth and decency are alive and well in the Jewish state of confusion. Labor Party member Luba Eliav a man whose moral rectitude can be verified by asking him, angrily shouts them down: "The man [Kahane] is a racist whose teachings are those of the American Ku Klux Klan." (Davar, September 27). Eliav is a man of impressive political instability. A member of the Labor Party he left to join the extreme Left Sheli Party. When he failed in that, he formed his own party in 1984 and lost badly. He became famous that election night as he saw Kahane winning a Knesset seat even as he was going down to defeat, and proclaiming: "That psychotic wins a seat and I lose..."

On the eve of the meeting of the Knesset Elections Committee to vote on whether to ban Kach, no less than five parties have demanded that democracy take a back seat to the drive against "racism." In addition to the Center, Likud, Labor and the Progressives, the Marxist Mapam Party now adds its own demand, saying: "Concerning Kach it is enough to say that it has adopted the path of the Nazi regime and marches on it."

No less than that.

On the last day of filing requests to ban Knesset party lists, the Kach Movement tables a request to ban all the parties running! Even the cynical Kahane-hating reporters who cover the Knesset shake their heads in amused admiration over the step that is clearly deadly serious beneath its apparent Quixotic aspect.

Through the Kach delegate to the Knesset Central Elections Committee (KCEC), attorney Rachamim Cohen, we argue that under paragraph 7a of the Basic Law: The Knesset (the law under which Kach faces a ban), every party running in this election or in any election in Israel must be banned. Under the law, says Kach, no party can stand for Knesset elections if it negates both "the existence of the State of Israel as the state of the Jewish people," (7a1) and "the democratic character of the state." (7a2). These two conditions, we maintain, are contradictory. One who insists that the State of Israel is the home of the Jewish people (which is the essence of Zionism) and thus cannot ever be allowed to be given over to the sovereignty of any of those who are not Jewish, by definition cannot accept the "democratic character of the state." For democracy says the Kach petition, means that people are given rights (including sovereignty) on the basis of themselves, as individuals, and not because of their particular religious or national origin. Thus, if Arabs (or any non-Jews) would become the majority they would have the right to define the state in their own way-perhaps as the state of the Arab Palestine people.

In a word, argues Kach attorney Cohen, either a state is 'Jewish' or it is open to all to have control and sovereignty i.e. "democratic." But it cannot be both and no party can pay allegiance to both. Because of that, Kach divides the parties into two categories, the Zionist or Jewish parties on the one hand, and the non-Zionist or non-Jewish parties, on the other.

It then moves that all the former (Likud, Maarach, Tchiya, Tzomet, Mapam, Center, National Religious Party, Agudat Yisrael and Shas) be banned under 7a2, because being Zionist parties they negate the democratic character of the state... At the same time Kach asks that all the non-Zionist parties (Ratz, Progressive List for Peace, and the Communists) be banned under 7a1 for not recognizing Israel as the "State of the Jewish People." In addition, it asks that the Communists be also banned under 7a2 since, beside being anti-Zionist they are also anti-democratic.

The logic behind this is so clear that it is just as obvious that it has not the slightest possibility of being accepted by a committee that is judge and hangman, made up of the very parties that Kach is asking be banned!

Kach, however, is really speaking to the High Court. For if the Knesset law is, indeed, a contradiction that makes the entire political process unworkable, then the Knesset law is fatally flawed and thus effectively non-existent. That this message is aimed at the High Court (and the almost automatic need to appeal to it) is evidenced by the fact that when the Kach motion does, indeed, come up for a vote to the KCEC, Rachamim Cohen votes against his own motion!

His explanation? Kach absolutely refuses to accept the right of the Elections Committee, made up of Knesset parties who have a vested interest in banning dangerous rivals, to ban any party.

That night (September 29) is Chol Ha'moed (an intermediate day of the holiday) Sukkot. With all the political thunder and lightning crashing about us, we do not let up one whit in campaigning. Four appearances a night. Tonight is Ashkelon for the Saharana, the special festival of the Kurdish Jews. It is held in the city park with some 40,000 Kurdish Jews and other Sephardim, in attendance. All the political leaders, including President Herzog, Prime Minister Shamir and Shimon Peres, are there. But it is my appearance that makes clear why the obsession-to ban me... Tens and then hundreds rush forward shouting, "Kahane," "Kahane-king of Israel," "Kahane to power." I am kissed, embraced, raised on shoulders and a throng of hundreds, surrounded by literally thousands of others who clap and cheer, move toward the

platform where the other politicians are sitting and from which I am banned. "To the platform! To the platform!" the crowd shouts, as a large force of police and border patrol guards moves nervously to surround and cordon off the area.

"Let him speak! Let him speak!" The cry is taken up by thousands. President Herzog is interrupted in the middle of his speech. He glares at the crowd; dignitaries attempt to pacify him: he is not. He leaves. So does Peres who has just arrived. The crowd barely notices. This is Kach's evening. It is also almost a guarantee that we will be banned.

The hearing on the Kach ban is scheduled for Wednesday October 5. That weekend the news media is filled with discussions, pro and con, mostly con. Ha'Aretz (Friday, October 2), carries an article that succinctly states why the Likud is terrified of Kahane. Written by Boas Shapira, it points out that Kach's strength lies in the development towns and urban neighborhoods, the exact source of Likud power. Kahane, Shapira states flatly is a far greater danger to Likud than is any other party to the right, including the vaunted Tchiya.

He cites, from the 1984 elections, the following impressive percentage of votes in these development towns: Hatzor (6.8%); Beit Shean (5.6%); Or Akiva (5.1%); Safed (4.9%); Netivot (4.6%); Shlomi (4.5%); Beit Shemesh (4.3%); Rosh Ha'ayin (3.9%); Tiberias (3.6%). Concludes Shapira:

"Meir Kahane's success as opposed to the weakness of Tchiya teaches us that the vote for Kach does not stem only from Kahane's hawkishness but especially from his sharp rhetoric that kindles the masses and his interest in the communal discrimination and the suffering of the weak social classes."

A surprising bit of help comes from journalistic Orah-Shem-Or, who for a time was contemplating running on her own ticket for Knesset. (Shem-Or, mother-in-law of Israeli rock-singer Tzvika Pick, also advocates removal of the Arabs but is bitterly anti-religious). Shem-Or, in a letter to me, just before the KCEC hearing, sends me a copy of a poster that the City of Jerusalem refused to paste up on grounds of "racism." She also sends a copy of a High Court ruling on her appeal in which the judges affirm her right to have the posters affixed. In their opinion, they say that it is the right of every citizen to furnish information, express a view and raise issues for discussion.

She concludes her letter: "This decision represents an important judicial precedent and can serve you in your appeal against the Elections Committee." Ms. Shem-Or is an optimist.

On October 5, 1988, by a massive majority, the political parties that make up the Knesset Central Elections Committee, vote to ban Kach from being allowed to run in the democratic elections of the State of Israel on November 1st, 1988.

"The gangsters! How do they dare to ban you and allow the Arabs and Communists to stay in the Knesset?" It is the angry voice of a Jew in Jerusalem's Mahane Yehuda marketplace. He is one of the crowd of tens of people crowding about me, to shake my hand; to shout, "Kahane, don't give in to them!" to ask anxiously: "What is going to be with you now?"

It was the day after the Knesset Central Elections Committee had voted to ban the Kach Movement from running for the Knesset election on November 1st. In a remarkable display of unity the Likud and Labor, who for the past two years have outdone each other in bitter attacks, one against the other, joined to vote Kach off the ballot. And here, in the bastion of the Likud, the Jerusalem marketplace, the unexpected fallout is apparent.

"I have been a Likudnik for 40 years but today I am finished with them." "I cannot believe that the Likud would ban Kahane."

But of course, it was to be expected. A terrified Israeli Establishment had watched the steady rise and then explosion of popularity of Kach and realized that all its efforts-and they were legion!-had not been enough to stop Kach from emerging as the third largest party. Worse, for Likud and Tachia, Kahane was winning the battle of the young people and an entire generation of Kach voters was emerging, as young soldiers came back from face-to-face confrontation with the intifada.

"What is this-Russia?" shouts an angry young man, carrying a sack of food. And, indeed, the law passed in the Knesset was one that would have never been allowed in the United States.

In the marketplace, a Jew in the by-now huge crowd that is writhing and pushing around me, shouts: "What if you are banned by the court also?" "G-d forbid," shouts a woman, who cries to me: "Only you. We want only you." The man is insistent: "But what if the court bans you, should we vote for Gandhi?" "Gandhi" is Rehavam Zeevi, a former general who has jumped aboard the "transfer" train that Kach began so many years ago. He has formed a group called Moledet which speaks of "transfer m'ratzon"-voluntary transfer. "You look like a clever Jew," I say to the man. "Voluntary transfer? Only a demagogue would speak of such a thing. No Arab will leave, if given a chance to stay as a citizen. And secondly Gandhi speaks only of the Arabs of the territories and you know that the Arabs of Israel are a thousand times more dangerous."

The crowd murmurs its assent. The Jew who asked the question nods his head unhappily. The question remains for him: If not Kahane, for whom to vote? I push through the crowd as the Kach people begin the chant-Kahane la'shilton, (Kahane to power), and the crowd takes it up. A hefty butcher shouts: "Meir, Meir, come here!" He waves at a large picture of me that he has hung on his stall. As I approach, the huge bear of a man seizes me and shouts: "Zahav ata, (You are gold), ata ha'aba shelanu", (you are our father). He crushes me in his huge arms and the crowd is galvanized. As I break away an old man smiles at me and says: "Kacha haya im Begin" (This is how it was with Begin).

The crowd is now more heated and a chant begins: "Lo, lo, lo niteyn!" (No, no, we won't allow it). A young Jew shouts: "Neyred lamachteret! Nisrof et kahalpiyot!" (We'll go underground! We'll burn the polling places!) I think of this as I sit, an hour later, in a car traveling north to my rallies. Of course they will not go underground or burn anything. Now. But it is clear to me that if they do ban me, what they will have done is prevent a huge number of Israelis the right to democratically choose a party and program that they desire. In effect, democracy will have ceased to be an avenue for these people to take. This dictatorship of the Establishment will perforce compel growing numbers of Israelis to turn to violence and actions outside a democratic process that has turned corrupt and illegitimate. And any government of Israel will have no right to protest.

People with no choice have no choice. People whose democratic choice has been arrogantly taken from them have no choice but to turn to extra-democratic methods. As the intifada grows worse; as it spreads into Israel itself; as the Arabs of Israel increasingly join in; as the Arab population grows and threatens Israel's Jewishness; as more and more leftists split the nation and take the Arab side, stabbing the army and the state in the back; as the country's disintegration gallops ahead and the very future of Israel as a state and a Jewish people is endangered-a frightened, frustrated and angry people will turn on the impotent and bumbling Establishment that not only has no solution but that also destroyed the democratic right of people to vote for the one they believe in. They will turn against the illegitimate political process and its cynical godfathers.

It is now evening and I am in Kiryat Ata, a suburb of Haifa. It is my final rally of the day and I am bone weary but a huge crowd has gathered in the park adjoining the town hall. David Ben Dor, one of the Kach leaders, is speaking on the platform that is bedecked with Israeli and Kach flags. My automobile pulls up and a security group rushes up to it. As I get out, the crowd surges

forward and the chant begins: "Kahana!" They hyphenate it as they shout: Ka-HAH-Na! Ka-HAM-Na!" As I reach the platform, a woman rushes forward and thrusts a bouquet of flowers into my hands. The crowd is in a state of huge excitement, I cannot finish two sentences without chants and shouts of the by-now inevitable, "Ka-HAH-na!" But at one point they are quiet, and I speak softly:

"In less than a month you will enter the polling booth. Take with you a picture of your children. And then-when you are alone in that booth, take out the picture and look carefully at your children. Look and ask yourselves: Of all these parties for whom I am asked to vote-who will save my children...?"

The effect is electric. The crowd picks up the answer: "Ka-HAH na..."

I arrive home a little after midnight. I am more tired than I can imagine. But the next day I must be back in the north again for rallies in Nahariya and Shlomi and Maalot. As I fall asleep, in that last moment before consciousness leaves me, the face and voice of the Jew in the marketplace emerges: But what if you are banned by the court?" And the woman impulsively crying: "G~d forbid!"

But G~d grants man Free Will, and the power to choose between good and evil. And the High Court of Israel shamefully chose to lower justice and truth to a shameful level. On October 18, 1988, the Supreme Court of the Jewish State not only distorted Judaism and Zionism but dealt a death blow to democracy that created a precedent whose implications we may yet see. The Supreme Court of Israel upheld the political ruling of the Central Elections Committee and rules that Kach would be unable to participate in what is known as the democratic process of the Jewish state. At least 200,000 Israeli citizens were disenfranchised.

Before going into the exact legal moves for and against Kach, one should deal with the truly obscene charge that Kach and Kahane are racists. We live in a cheap, brazen world of political anarchy in which cheap and brazen politicians and news media, label and libel, defame and smear. Those who cannot debate will always defame and, in the end, defamation is the last refuge of non-thinkers and knaves.

"Racist?" Truly outrageous, truly obscene. Does Kach see Arabs or any non-Jews as being genetically or racially different from Jews? Does it deal with Jews and non-Jews on the basis of color or blood? Does it do what the Nazi and apartheid South African regimes did and do-make a certain class of people permanently inferior? Or does Kach say that the Arab, or any gentile, who sincerely converts according to halacha is the same as the Jew? As Meir Kahane!

The difference between Jew and gentile, according to Kach, is not a racial one, but a religious one. And it is not a distinction that originated with Kach, but with Torah Judaism! It is Judaism that distinguishes and discriminates between Jew and non-Jew, though not because of racism, but because there is a spiritual difference between the two, a difference that disappears the moment the gentile becomes a Jew. That is racism? Does not Kach have numerous former gentiles who have converted to Judaism and who are enthusiastic members and supporters? Does not Kach have as one of its members and supporters the convert to Judaism who is the former grandson of the vicious Moslem Jew-hater, Jaabri, former Mayor of Hebron? Did I not attend his wedding and dance with him, this man who was born an Arab Moslem and converted to Judaism and is now a Jew as any other, in Kach's eyes?

And does not Kach offer the Arabs a choice of remaining in Eretz Yisrael with all their personal rights but without national ones? And is this not Judaism? And is this not ultimately Zionism, the Zionism that defined the State of Israel as a Jewish state, in the Declaration of Independence? (And the fact that it went on to schizophrenically offer Arabs equal political rights, only under-lines the confusion and intellectual hypocrisy of Zionist leaders). In the end, those who called for a Jewish state and who framed laws that discriminated against non-Jews (the Law of

Return and the Jewish National Fund), did so because they intended that non-Jews would never control the Jewish state. Is this racism? Is this democracy? The hypocrisy and fraud rise unto the heavens.

Concerning the racist label, the Kach attorneys raised all the logical, obvious proofs that Kach is not racist. But more to the point, was the amendment to the anti-racist bill that was put in at the last moment and which reads: "Publication of a quotation from religious writings or prayer books, or protection of religious ritual, shall not be considered a violation under the law (i.e. shall not be called racist)".

It is this that should have saved Kach from the legal charge of racism, for every word and every thought of Kach is based on Judaism, halacha, religious quotes and efforts to preserve ritual and Jewish law. That is why leftist after leftist who, for months and months had demanded an anti-racist law, rose to condemn this one and asked that it be defeated. That is why Victor Shem-Tov of the Marxist Mapam Party told the Knesset on the fateful night that it passed the anti-racist bill:

"There is no way to deal with this legislation seriously Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we will vote against this bill" And that is why Ron Cohen of Ratz said: "We are better off without this bill," And this is why Mordechai Vershuvshy, a bitter Kahane-hater, said: "I ask that this amendment be defeated. For if we accept it, then this bill will not be one of which will be proud and will not serve as a weapon in the fight against racism."

And that is why fully 22 leftists voted against the bill and why Meir Kahane voted for it! (In the words of Communist MK Meir Vilner: "The fact that Meir Kahane supported it is one big joke.")

The Kach attorneys zeroed in on the utter hypocrisy of a state that defines itself as "Jewish" and "Zionist," calling Kach "racist," because it differentiated between Jews and non-Jews in terms of equal political rights.

This from a country which has a Law of Return that allows only Jews the right of automatic entry into and citizenship of Israel. This from a state that limits the sale of state lands to Jews. This from a state that defines itself in its own Declaration of Independence as "the JEWISH State." This from a state that sees Knesset and cabinet members bemoaning the flight of Jews from the Galilee and which adopts a law to "Judaize" that region. This from a state that sees the Labor Party and Mr. Peres on TV election commercials warning that holding on to the "occupied territories" will lead to too many Arabs and, in their own words, "we must hold on to the majority." One wonders what Israeli Arabs think of that Clearly about what they thought when Labor Prime Minister Golda Meir said: "I do not want to wake up each morning thinking how many Arab babies were born last night."

Kach indignantly rejected the label of racism and condemned those who banned Kach as essentially attacking the Torah of Israel, Judaism, since everything that Kach stood for was based on Torah Judaism, whether one was happy with that or not.

But even more. Assuming that a party in Israel was racist, would that be grounds for banning it? In a democracy, the moment one sets up a personal standard of what is beyond the pale, what is "dangerous", what must be banned, he opens the door to someone else doing the same. The Right wing sincerely believes that the Left endangers Israeli existence. Religious Jews honestly believe that secular Jews menace Jewish survival by their trampling on halacha. Will those who banned Kach agree that they too, have the right, in a democracy to ban those whom they see as dangerous?

As far as the second charge, that Kach was opposed to "democracy, ' here those who barred Kach were attacking the very basis of Zionism, were cutting off the very branch upon which they sat. For Kach was certainly against the western form of democracy but by the same token

so was Judaism and so was Zionism. Kach stated loudly and clearly:

"There is a basic contradiction between Zionism, a Jewish State and Judaism-all of whom demand a Jewish State, one that will always be controlled by Jews-and western democracy which does not recognize "Jews" or "Arabs" but insists that whoever is the majority has the right to control the country Today, Israel is a Jewish state and the national anthem which speaks of "the soul of a Jew yearning," and its Independence Day which commemorates the defeat of the Arabs who wished an Arab state, Palestine, in its place, are clear barometers of it. Except for a handful of gentilized Hebrews, no Jew is prepared to allow democracy and Arab demography to give the Arabs the peaceful right to be the majority and do away democratically with the Jewish state. And the ultimate question for those who ban me and defame me as a "racist" is: "Do the Arabs have the theoretical right to peacefully and democratically become the majority and vote to change the Jewish state of Israel into the state of Palestine?"

What I say is pure Zionism. What I say is authentic JUDAISM. No matter how much it pains judges, politicians, Establishment figures and other intellectually assimilated Jews, Judaism does not recognize equal political status for Jews and non-Jews in the Jewish State.

And as far as the democratic" character of Israel is concerned, let it be clear that the entire law is not only a joke but one that is fatally flawed. Under it, every Knesset party today and every Knesset party that will ever sit, can be banned.

The law bans parties that negate either the democratic character of the state or the Jewish character of it. A more ludicrous contradiction could not have been created by a second-year law student. If a political party accepts the Jewish character of the state, it cannot accept the democratic character of it. Jewish "character" bars non-Jews from being a majority and democratically creating a non-Jewish state. By the same token, if a political party accepts the democratic character of the state, it asserts that Jews and non-Jews are equal and that non-Jews, Arabs, have the democratic right of changing the character of Israel if they can. It is an absurd law; it is a schizophrenic law, and it is a law that is impossible to implement without destroying the entire Israeli political process.

Under this absurd law, every single party in the Knesset can be challenged under one or the other of the two grounds for banning-all the Zionist and Jewish-character parties banned because they violate the democratic character" clause, and all the now Zionist parties banned under the "Jewish character" clause.

Nothing helped. Neither logic, nor justice, nor Judaism. The High Court of Israel joined the lowest of the low in trampling on truth and the Jewish State.

It was this attack on western democracy and its incompatibility with Zionism's concept of a "Jewish State" that brought forth one of the most incredible if not outrageous legal dictums imaginable. And it came from, of all people, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Shamgar, who declared:

There is no validity in the argument that there is, ostensibly, a contradiction between the several sub-paragraphs of paragraph 7a. The existence of the State of Israel as the State of the Jewish people does not negate its democratic nature, just as the Frenchness of France does not negate its democratic nature."

Incredible! Coming from a freshman in a logic class, it would get a well-deserved grade of "F." Coming from the Chief Justice of a High Court, one is simply appalled. What a comparison! The "Frenchness" of France and the "Jewishness" of Israel! Note the difference of Shamgar's own comparison. He uses two totally equal concepts in discussing France, i.e. the Frenchness of France. He does not, however, speak of the Israeliness of Israel. He does not, because he cannot, because Israel was not established as the home of the Israeli people, but that of the

Jewish people. One becomes a Frenchman through the simple act of being born within a certain territory or acquiring citizenship within that territory. "Frenchness" as far as France is concerned is not a national origin since a Pole can come to France and simply by acquiring French citizenship become a Frenchman.

But he does not become a Jew through living in Israel. At most he becomes an Israeli. In order to become a Jew he must go through a religious conversion and until he does that he is not a Jew and since the State of Israel is defined as the Jewish State and not the Israeli state, someone who is not a Jew cannot be allowed to become the majority or else there will be no Jewish State! And that is why Israel, as the Jewish state, discriminates by law against non-Jews. And Shamgar and all the others know this very well and their refusal to admit it, indeed their outrageous twisting of both logic and law, is inexcusable.

Because of the equality of Jewish religion and nationality, there is for both halacha and Zionism a very different concept of sovereignty, of ownership of land, and of citizenship, from that of western democracy. Western civilization takes a piece of territory and declares that everyone born or naturalized within that territory regardless of national origin or religion, is a citizen, is the owner and sovereign over that piece of land. It is the land that defines the person and his status.

Judaism totally rejects that concept. It disdains the idea that a piece of land takes precedence over a people, that a piece of land decides the status of the people living in it.

Judaism states that a people defines the land.

That the land is nothing more than a vessel that holds the people: the land serves the people as the home of the people. The land is called the Land of Israel, for precisely the logical reason that it is the land of the people of Israel, the Jews. The land of any people belongs to a people that has common origin, religion, culture, language, family, so that it can live in that land and continue to create their own special national-family life.

For Judaism, that being so, it follows that people who are not of that nation-family have no sovereignty or national rights in that land, at all. They are strangers and if they would live there, they may become resident strangers (geri toshav) but only after accepting the conditions of the people to whom the land belongs.

They are not citizens, they do not vote, they do not sit in the Knesset. If they agree to this, then they may remain in the land as non-citizen resident strangers with their personal rights but no national ones, and should be treated with personal respect and mercy and justice-but nothing more.

And it was not Kahane but the great Talmudic codifier Maimonides, who wrote in his classic Mishne Torah: Not only the king, but even the one who dotes out the water for the fields-not to mention a judge or prince-can only be from Israel [a Jew]." Does this kind of thing, does Kahane's insistence on saying it, strike terror into the heart of Jewish leaders? And because of that do they do everything-including banning-to make sure that the voice is silenced? The answers are too obvious.

That kind of concept is so foreign to the gentitized Hebrews as well as the non-Israeli Hellenists of the Jewish Establishment, that it drives them intellectually mad to even consider that it might be Jewish. And so they must deny that it is Jewish, no matter how fraudulent and ludicrous that denial may be. They must deny it in every possible way. By silencing those who persist in speaking it; by banning them from their right to speak and to propagate the view; by attempting to write legal opinions that simply ignore it, and, of course, even by writing a regal opinion which is so clearly fraudulent to anyone with a mind to think.

The Knesset of Israel, and worse, its High Court, have declared war on Judaism. The first bloody battle consisted of their hypocritical and fearful flight from truth, their contemptuous denial that Judaism is Judaism, their parade of legal nudity in the hope that no child would shout: "But you are naked!"

But they are...

And what may terrify them even more is the Kach proclamation of the contradiction between western democracy and Zionism of any kind, be it the most secular. Zionism, the movement for a Jewish state, is the movement for a state that will always have Jewish sovereignty and Jewish control and Jewish mastery over its fate. And that can only be done through a Jewish majority and a large one, at that. Does western democracy speak of "Jewish" majority or "Arab" majority or any hyphenated one? Of course not. It speaks of one person, one vote, and if the Arabs will peacefully sit and become the majority, why then they have the right to control the country! That is western democracy.

Is there a contradiction between that western democracy and Zionism? Of course! Do Shamgar and the other westernized intellectuals of Israel realize that? Of course! Does that terrify them? Of course! Will they attempt everything imaginable to twist, pervert and confuse the issues and logic? Of course! And that's the root of the shameful approach of the shameful ban on Kach.

But of course, the consequences are frightening.

By passing a law that allows the banning of a party whose views ("racist," "anti-democratic") are considered dangerous and repugnant to them, the Knesset and judges of Israel have opened the door to others, to banning parties whose views are anathema to them. To a religious Jew in Israel, a party that is irreligious or anti-religious is not only anathema but dangerous to Israel's survival because it is only faith in G-d that will save Israel from Divine punishment. To a whole host of Jews, parties that call for territorial concessions, that attack the army's actions, that call for recognition of the PLO, are seditious groups that threaten the very existence of Israel. Shall we have the right to ban these parties? The precedent has already been established.

And finally. By taking away the right of well over 200,000 citizens to vote for the party of their choice, Israel has opened the door to anarchy and collapse of the democratic process. Israel is a state that is in a state of collapse. The Arab uprising, the attack by the left and intellectuals on the justice of Israel's cause, the impotency of the government from Left to Right, the sense of growing Arab power and hostility within Israel itself, will all add up to an Israeli who is frustrated, bitter and, above all, frightened for the very survival of his state and family.

He will not sit quietly. And if the democratic door of solution is locked to him-if he cannot vote for the party of his choice-he will take extra-democratic steps. And let no government or intellectual or liberal complain. There is no difference between a one-party state and a state which is multi-party but one, the one I wish to vote for. Both have taken away my democratic option and that leaves desperate people no choice but to take matters into their own hands. Is this what Israel wishes? Perhaps not, but this is what Israel has sown.

The seeds of revolution. And let none dare to complain.

For again, it is imperative to again ask the fundamental question:

If the great thinkers who laid the groundwork for the relationship between government and individual agreed that man has the right to rise up against an Authority that robs him of his rightful property;

If the men democracies honor so-Locke and Rousseau and Jefferson and Thoreau and King-cried out the moral and natural right of people to defy government over freedom, equality morality

property;

If the right to challenge, defy disobey and fight against Authority is valid even in issues that do not involve a real threat to life and existence;

Is it not then certainly valid and just and obligatory to defy an Authority that lays down a policy that threatens the very lives of citizens!

Is it not legitimate to challenge an Authority which is either unable or unwilling to put an end to a terror that takes the lives of citizens and that threatens the very existence of the state?

Is not the most basic of rights the right of life, and is not the essence of property the possession of life?

Is not a government that endangers life through its inept policy and that prevents the citizen from exerting all means at his command to insure that life, a government that has lost legitimacy and that must be challenged?

And if a law or laws can be a reason for defiance of government, what shall be the fate of an Authority whose entire policy threatens the lives of people?

Surely these are questions that are legitimate, though, in the present State of Israel, they are more than capable of inviting arrest. What the Authority in Israel does not understand, however, is that arrests of people who raise the questions that tug at the hearts and minds of citizens, will do nothing except to enrage those citizens. The Israeli Authority is woefully out of touch with the people and drives them precisely to the civil disobedience they warn against as being illegal.

Without a change in policy on the part of the Israeli Authority a change that will crush the terror and the enemy that murders Jews in their own land regularly, only one thing stands between the Authority and the rising of the people.

THAT ONE THING-THAT ONE HOPE-IS A NATIONAL EMERGENCY REFERENDUM.

Chapter 13: Referendum

Merely having a political system of representative government is hardly a guarantee that the voice and will of the people are truly being represented, that their cries are being heard and cared for. Representative government, especially in its modern political party form, easily degenerates into a corrupt empire of narrow interest and people whose overriding concern is power.

Democracy arose, in our times, as the reaction against despotism and totalitarianism. More and more, ever larger sections of the people began to demand the right to decide their own futures, to decide for themselves issues that affected their own lives, It is from this that there evolved the system of representative government under which the people go to the polls and elect representatives, i.e. people who will represent them and supposedly express and act for their-the people's-views and interests.

The concept of representative government is admitted by all not to be the ideal of democracy That can only be when each and every citizen, personally and directly votes on the issues affecting him. That is true and pure democracy. And indeed, that is how democracy was practiced by the citizens of Rome assembled in the capitol, and, too, by the Greeks, the Macedonians and the ancient Franks. This, too, was the folk-mote in Swiss cantons where the Landsgemeinde was the prevailing institution and, of course, there was the town-meeting in the New England colonies.

It was the simple impossibility of gathering the huge numbers of citizens of modern day states to vote on all issues, that com-pelled the people to agree to the idea of having representatives stand in for them. Not the best ideal of democracy, not the happiest thing, but the only practical one, if one wished to have some form of democracy.

Of course, not only was this system of indirect democracy by its very nature less than the ideal, but the theory that underlay it was at best naive. The entire concept of a representative in a Parliament or Congress or Knesset representing people, was based on the legal theory of Agency. This speaks of a legal relation by virtue of which one party known as agent, authorized to represent and act for another, known as the principal in the latter's dealings. The distinguishing features and essential elements of Agency are that the agent is a representative and cannot act for himself but only for his principal; that the principal has a right to control all the acts of his agent and, given that, all acts of the agent that are within the scope of his authority are binding upon the principal.

Given the Agency relationship of representative and citizen, political theory postulates and thus justifies the legitimacy of representative government, by assuming that the representative always acts as agent for the citizen, always does that which the citizen, his principal, wishes.

That is, of course, utter nonsense under any kind of representative government and, indeed, there is increasingly bold and public expression by many representatives to the effect that they have a right to substitute their judgment for that of the citizens who elected them.

And pure, real democracy becomes even more grossly distorted by the rise of the party system, a thing that more and more-as the party system grows more powerful-comes into conflict with clear popular aspirations. That the interest of the parties and the men who run them often stand in opposition to the views of the people is too clear to be even seriously debated. And yet, the party has become an inseparable part of modern representative government. To quote Disraeli, "without party Parliamentary government is impossible."

As the party grows more powerful, its ability to entrench itself and frustrate the vote through the creation of a political system that is a self-perpetuating one, grows. Parties in Parliament can vote themselves huge amounts of funds that give them an unbridgeable advantage over other parties and certainly over any new ones that may seek to compete with them. Parties can, and do, create Parliamentary rules that favor to an unbearable degree the large party over the small and new ones. Election rules are made that are clearly biased against new parties and against change. In short, a political Mafia grows up, often involving several parties-even those of bitterly differing views-whose common interest in retaining power creates a united front of political venality and empire. Worst the dictatorship of the party acquires a contempt for the electorate, based upon a confidence in the impotence of the people to change the situation.

And to say that the people can change this, is a thing more easily expressed than accomplished. The large parties control many jobs and many favors. Their patronage system corrupts the individual through the narrow interest of the job it gives him, making him a loyal party vassal whose own interest and that of the party become one, regardless of party policy. By their political control of Ministries the parties can-through those departments-decide who will get an apartment, who will get a contract, who will get a permit, who will get a mortgage, who will get farm subsidies, who will get the thousand-and-one little things that are so vital for the ordinary lives of the ordinary citizen.

The "little man" does not easily fight City Hall, let alone storm the ramparts of the Knesset Castle.

And when a new party is allocated a mere pittance of television time in relation to the huge amount allotted to the major parties; and when television and radio, in general, are in the hands of the giants; and when the parties decide that they shall get huge sums for their election

campaign and the new party get nothing-why, the immense difficulty in changing the corrupt political system of the corrupt political Mafia, becomes almost agonizingly evident.

What has happened over the years of party representative government, is that the power of corruption has given us a system of dictatorship by the party. The immense power and money that the parties possess guarantee them political sovereignty and encourages even more arrogance, and even more contempt for the people they supposedly represent, and even more grabs at power and money, and laws and regulations that bolster a system that grants them even more power and money and even more laws that limit and emasculate the power of new parties.

THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PARTY.

That is what has emerged; that is certainly what exists today in Israel.

In his book "THE PEOPLE AND THE PARTY SYSTEM", Vernon Bogdanor has this to say about the political dictatorship of the Party in Israel:

"In the simplest form of list system-the national list as used in Israel-there is one national constituency, and the elector cannot vote for an individual candidate, only for a complete and unalterable party list drawn up by the party before the election. There is no element of personal choice of candidate or local representation in the system, and therefore no link between the elector and his representative in the legislature. The party decides which of its members are to be ejected, and the vote is still considered by many to be a vote for a doctrine..."

"The central weakness of such a system is the power which it yields to the party organization to decide which candidates are to appear on the list and in what order. The voter cannot change the order of the candidates on the list, nor eliminate candidates; he can play no part in either the construction of the list, or the process of coalition formation following the election; and every Israeli government since the foundation of the state has been a coalition. According to Duverger, 'The internal oligarchy reigns supreme in the Proportional Representation system with fixed lists and the ranking of candidates in a strict order which determines their election, for here the parliamentary representatives are chosen by the inner circle; the party in this case is a closed circuit.' This is nearer to the truth in Israel than in any other country with a proportional representation system"

Reading this, the question is: WHAT CHANGE THROUGH "ORDINARY CHANNELS?". Precious little.

The iron grip that the political parties have over the political system in Israel guarantees the impossibility of real change. And this political stranglehold comes at a time when the horror of an intifada, of attacks on Jews on their roads, in their streets, on their buses, in their marketplaces-makes life increasingly unbearable, makes fear a permanent part of their daily lives. It takes place against a background of an Arab population inside the land that grows enormously in quantity and quality, and the specter of Arab demography combined with Israeli democracy threatens to turn Israel into a bloody Sri Lanka. Frustration, anger, bitterness and real rear are the order of the day for the Israeli Jew.

It appears terribly obvious that the government of Israel has not the slightest idea of the depth of the anger, resentment, frustration and fear felt by the overwhelming majority of Jewish citizens. The situation is terribly reminiscent of the immense gap that existed between the ancient order authority in France and the people. The leaders of Israel exist on almost another planetary plane in their lack of comprehension of what the citizens of the country think and feel. The government simply is so isolated from the feelings of the people that it risks an explosion.

An ironic event took place on July 25, 1989, in the Knesset of Israel. The Israeli Parliament passed, on a first reading, a bill tabled by Knesset member Michael Bar Zohar on the subject of "The Individual's Right Over His Body" While the subject of the bill was the right of an individual to determine with all knowledge whether to amputate one of his limbs, the irony is more than clear.

The right of a man to one of his limbs was agreed upon by all parties of the house, from Right to Left, If so, what of the totality of the body of the citizen? What of his right to the safety of his entire body-of his life itself?

When the classic western thinkers of modern, liberal democracy declared the sanctity of property and the only legitimate reason for the existence of government as being the protection of the property of the individual, they clearly included in the concept of property' the life of the individual. It was in order to protect his life and property and for that reason alone, that the individual of secular western thought allowed government to rise and rule. And again, the greatest of property rights possessed by man is his right to life and limbs themselves.

It is not only the fact that government itself may act in a manner that threatens an individual's life. According to western thinking, if a government refuses to protect that citizen from harm, that too is a breach of the social contract. That too, brings into question the legitimacy of that government.

If when the United States, for example, following the Supreme Court's ruling that schools throughout the South must be integrated, had refused to protect the Black students wishing to attend the previously all-White schools, and thus placed those students in danger, can anyone argue that the government had failed to fulfill its basic obligation? More, can anyone say the Blacks would not have been legally and morally correct in defending themselves? And if the government would have gone further and jailed Blacks who were in the act of defending themselves, what would western world have said? What would the Jewish leaders of the State of Israel have said? Whether a government directly tyrannizes the lives of its citizens or simply allows others to threaten and embitter their lives, it has broken its social contract, violated its obligation to its citizens and brought into question its own legitimacy.

Does that mean that the citizen has a right to rebel? Does this justify revolution? Certainly the government of Israel would dearly love us to say this in order to brutally jail and repress people who question its policies. It dearly wishes to use the word "revolution" in order to crush anyone who threatens its hegemony. Let us not give them that opportunity.

Certainly the initial angry and even desperate reaction of people against the government need not be "revolution." Revolution, i.e. violence, is a thing that each and every Jew should look upon as the most serious and dangerous of things, a concept that one should attempt to shunt aside, if at all possible. There are certainly other things that can be attempted before Jews even think of "revolution."

Desperate people and moral thinkers have long faced the question of conflict between basic natural and moral rights on the one hand, and repressive or apathetic government on the other. Many have met this problem with a demand for a basic change in the political system that returns power to its original and rightful repository-the people.

Consider.

Rousseau deeply mistrusted any form of representative government, stating:

"The sovereign, having no other force but the legislative power, acts only by the laws; and the laws being only the authentic act of the general will (volonte generale), the sovereign can never act but when the people are assembled... every law the

people has not ratified in person is null and void-is, in fact, not a law. The people of England regards itself as free; but it is grossly mistaken, It is free only during the election of members of Parliament. As soon as they are elected, slavery overtakes it..."

Deploing the fact that the "lukewarmness of patriotism, the activity of private interest, the vastness of the States, conquest and the abuse of government suggested the method of having deputies of representatives of the people in the national assemblies," he gloomily admitted that:

"Because of these reasons there has never been a real democracy and there never will be... It is unimaginable that the people should remain continually assembled to devote their time to public affairs, and it is clear that they cannot set up commissions for that purpose without the form of administration being changed."

But accepting this sad fact of life, Rousseau said that, at least, people should retain the right to change the character and personnel of government as often as they like. He understood the concept, in a sense, of the need for an "outgoing revolution" lest the representatives (and parties) wax fat, grow thick, become gross and forsake their roles as strict and obedient followers and agents of the people.

An echo of what Rousseau said more than two centuries ago, could be heard in 1969 in the writings of the British Parliamentarian Lord Hailsham:

"I believe in Parliament. I believe in parties. I believe in Ministerial authority and responsibility, But I believe the traditional institutions of this country are In danger of collapse, because to use an expressive Americanism, they are ceasing to be credible, They are ceasing to be credible because we are hopelessly over-centralized, and because the rule of law has been continuously eroded by the perpetual series of crises, international and economic... We are near a crise de regime passing beyond the bounds of a crise d'administration in which much that is venerable and valuable in the life of this country may be seriously threatened. There are many loyal men and women in all walks of life who love their country and its institutions and who are still deeply concerned about their future, Because of the particular form that these institutions have taken we have no formal machinery for radical constitutional change. We have evolved, bit by bit, and are surely wise to have pursued through the centuries the path of evolution rather than revolution. But precisely because we have no formal machinery there are certain blind spots in our political spectrum..."

"Government by mere majority has its limitations. There are moments in a free society when a more general consensus is required to achieve a radical change without violence. This is recognized in most created constitutions by making constitutional change dependent on something more than the majority in a legislative chamber."

When a people becomes disillusioned over government, and sees itself as a helpless pawn in the hands of the people and parties who are supposed to represent them, who are supposed to be their loyal agents, and who have, instead, built for themselves a political empire that guarantees continued power, and who do not allow the people, the real sovereigns, the right to declare for themselves what they wish, then you have the ingredients for revolution. And in the eyes of many one that is justified.

The hope of averting explosion, violence, revolution lies in a Golden Mean between pure democracy under which the people vote on every issue and representative party democracy under which the people abdicate to the Dictatorship of the Party and vote on not a single issue-including those that affect their very lives. That Golden Mean, that hope, is the Referendum, initiative, plebiscite, and it has a long and important history in many truly

democratic countries. All the more reason, therefore, that it should become part of the political system of Israel.

A REFERENDUM IS BASED UPON THE FOLLOWING CONCEPTS:

I - In a western, democratic state, the ultimate sovereignty in any state lies with the people. They are masters and lords over the land.

II - Only the people have a right to decide their own fate and to rule on issues that affect their lives.

III - Only because of the impracticality of having all the people directly voting on every single issue, do they agree to a system of indirect democracy i.e. to having individuals represent them and their interests in a legislative body called parliament, Knesset, etc.

IV - These representatives are bound in a relationship of agent to principal, and must faithfully and loyally follow the dictates of the people. They are bound to protect and defend the rights of the people. When they do not, they breach the social contract and lose their legitimacy and their right to govern and coerce the people.

V - There is no "right" of the people more basic than that of life and body. It is the governments basic obligation to protect that and when it either cannot or, for some reason, refuses to, it has breached the social contract which alone, gives it the right to rule, to coerce, to be legitimate.

VI - Even when this has not taken place, the people-as principal-have a right to temporarily decide on any specific issue that they see as basic and fundamental, to tell their representatives to step aside and to allow them, the people, to personally vote and decide on that issue. This process is known as a referendum or initiative or plebiscite, and is accomplished through a demand to the legislature to begin the process. (This demand, to vote on the issue is usually validated by a particular number of citizens adhering to it.)

The referendum is a restatement and a reminder that it is the People that is sovereign and lord of the manor. It is a reminder that Parliament, Knesset or what have you, is merely its agent, permitted by the principal, the people, to act within the rules of the first and foremost duty of an agent to his principal: loyalty. It is a reminder that Parliament, the Knesset, the parties, as loyal and trusted agents, cannot act for themselves and the people have a right to control the acts of their agents. It is a statement and a reminder that if the agent breaches his trust, he may be dismissed out of hand and his master can, at any time, decide the issues himself.

The referendum is a weapon of the people to be used against the Dictatorship of the parties. It is a threat to the parties, who fear it as the plague, for they rightly understand that it threatens to take from them the sweetest and most precious of all things-power, power, power.

The dictatorship of the Party is in a sense a different version of the dictatorship of the autocrat or king. When the political party controls the people, allowing them no opportunity to demand and express sovereignty, the social contract has been breached. Referendum is a cry from the soul of the people; a demand from their loins; a battle cry: Return to us our sovereignty! And return, you, to your proper place and status-the servant of the people.

In a word, the referendum is not only a basic right, it is a safely valve for anger, bitterness and violence. For embittered people it is an alternative to a revolution that all decent people shrink from unless there is no other choice.

To understand the debate over the referendum in its greatest clarity, one must look at the turmoil over the issue that took place in Great Britain during the years 1867-1918, between the second and fourth Reform Acts. Under strong Prime Ministers such as Disraeli and Gladstone,

British political parties grew in power and presented themselves to the voters in general policy terms. Men like Joseph Chamberlain believed that the parties should present specific programs to the voters which would bind the party to carry them out.

Then, in 1890, the great constitutional lawyer, A. V. Dicey, advocated that the referendum be made part of the political system. He was supported by the Liberal Unionists who sought to use it to prevent Irish Home Rule, and they fought the December 1910 election on the principal that major constitutional changes should be put to the people before becoming a law. The Unionist leader, Arthur Balfour, on November 29, 1910 addressed the London conservatives in Albert Hall. He presented clearly the major advantage of the Referendum:

"The Referendum has an enormous advantage, It does not involve a General election; it does not involve all the personal bitterness inevitably involved in a contest between the two competitors for a seat; it does not carry with it a change of Government; and it does get a clear verdict from the people. (Cheers). I should have thought that with this method of dealing with deadlocks or collisions of opinion between the two Houses of Parliament, when once suggested, the whole Radical Party would have competed in their anxious desire to make the project their own, and to say 'Here at least is our ideal of government by the people and for the people really carried into effect.'"

Salisbury said in 1872:

"I draw the widest possible distinction between the opinions of the House of Commons and the opinions of the Nation... that the House of Commons is the expression of the opinion of the Nation is a constitutional fiction which it is convenient for practical purposes to respect."

Anyone who looks into the State of Israel with its yawning gap between the views of its people on the Arab situation and the policy of its government, would vigorously agree with Salisbury.

In 1973, the British government did permit a referendum, over the status of Northern Ireland. The two questions presented to the voters were, "Do you want Northern Ireland to remain a part of the United Kingdom?" and "Do you want Northern Ireland to be joined with the Irish Republic outside the United Kingdom?"

In 1971, the British Conservative government of Edward Heath secured agreement of the European Economic Community on the terms for British entry. But both major parties-the Conservatives and Labor-were deeply divided over this issue which involved such a basic change in powers that had once been exclusively national and would now, become "European."

A bitter debate swept the country, and Laborite Douglas Jay was the first to call for a referendum on the issue, declaring, "Where the constitution and the powers of Parliament itself are being altered, there is unique justification for a referendum..." But what finally tipped the scales for the idea was a remarkable book by a Conservative MP, Philip Goodhart, who was pro-entry but who found it intolerable that on an issue of such fundamental importance, the people should not have a direct say.

THE NEED AND THE RIGHT TO A REFERENDUM IN THE JEWISH STATE IS BASIC.

In the heavy-handed and powerful governmental-bureaucratic structure that is the political system of Israel, parties and Knesset members have created a situation in which the seat of sovereignty, the people, bows to those it chose to carry out its wishes, the representatives and parties. The latter control the lives of the people and put down any effort to re-establish the sanity the purity and legality of real democracy-the right of the people to rule, decide and decree.

Let no one delude himself into believing that the people of Israel are not bitter, angry, frightened and frustrated as their very lives and those of their children grow increasingly more tenuous while they are in the hands of "servants who rule." Let no one discount the possibility of an explosion on the part of desperate people. And let no one delude himself.

The answer is surely obvious; Referendum. Let the people speak. Let them speak for themselves. Let them feel that they take their future and that of their loved ones in their own hands and decide on those basic, fundamental issues that, today, tear the nation apart in fruitless, sterile and hating debate. Enough debate and enough anger and enough hate and enough impotency. Let the questions be put to the test. Let the people decide. Through a referendum, a plebiscite, a proposition. Through the direct expression of their will.

Let the people go to the polls and vote "Yes" or "No" on the following basic referendum:

Shall the present Knesset be immediately dissolved, new elections held within a month which shall be open to all parties, including Kach, and shall all parties be bound to implement the following minimal program:

The crushing of the Arab revolt by every means possible;

The annexation of Judea-Samaria-Gaza;

The removal of all Arabs who are not prepared to accept the exclusive sovereignty of the Jewish people over all of the Land of Israel and their (the Arab) right to remain in the land as non-citizens with all their personal rights but no national ones?

This is a referendum that goes to the heart of the national debate now taking place in Israel, ripping her apart as no answer is given. Here is the opportunity at long last, to allow the people to give definitive answers. Here, the answer will not be given by political parties with small minds and narrower interests. Here, the people will have spoken.

Once again, before it is too late, let us cease our impotent efforts at self-delusion, our avoidance of the terribly difficult, terrible reality